arXiv:1511.05931v3 [math.LO] 16 Feb 2016

On generalized Van-Benthem-type characterizations

Grigory K. Olkhovikov
Dept of Philosophy II, Ruhr-Universität Bochum
Dept. of Philosophy, Ural Federal University
tel.: +49-15123307070
email: grigory.olkhovikov@rub.de, grigory.olkhovikov@gmail.com

Abstract. The paper continues the line of [6], [7], and [8]. This results in a model-theoretic characterization of expressive powers of arbitrary finite sets of guarded connectives of degree not exceeding 1 and regular connectives of degree 2 over the language of bounded lattices.

Keywords. model theory, modal logic, intuitionistic logic, propositional logic, asimulation, bisimulation, Van Benthem's theorem.

This paper is a further step in the line of our enquiries into the expressive powers of intuitionistic logic and its extensions. This line started in late 2011, when we began to think about possible modifications of bisimulation relation in order to obtain the full analogue of Van Benthem modal characterization theorem for intuitionistic propositional logic. For the resulting modification, which was published in [6], we came up with a term "asimulation", since one of the differences between asimulations and bisimulations was that asimulations were not symmetrical.

Later we modified and extended asimulations in order to capture the expressive powers of first-order intuitionistic logic (in [7]) and some variants of basic modal intuitionistic logic (in [8]) viewed as fragments of classical first-order logic. Some other authors were also working in this direction; e.g. in [2] this line of research is extended to bi-intuitionistic propositional logic, although the author prefers directed bisimulations to asimulations.

In this paper we publish a general algorithm allowing for an easy computation of asimulation-like notions for a class of fragments of classical first-order logic that can be naturally viewed as induced by some kind of intensional propositonal logic via the corresponding notion of standard translation. The group of appropriate intensional logics includes all of the above mentioned logics (except, for obvious reasons, the first-order intuitionistic logic) but also many other formalisms. It is worth noting that not all of these formalisms are actually extensions of intuitionistic logic, in fact, even the classical modal propositional logic which is the object of the original Van Benthem modal characterization theorem[1], is also in this group. Thus the generalized asimulations defined in this paper have an equally good claim to be named generalized bisimulations, and if we still continue to call them asimulations, we do it mainly because for us these

[1]For its formulation see, e.g. [3, Ch.1, Th. 13].

relations and their use are inseparable from the above-mentioned earlier results on the expressive power of intuitionistic logic.

The rest of this paper has the following layout. Section 1 fixes the main preliminaries in the way of notation and definition. In Section 2 we give some simple facts about Boolean functions and define the notion of a standard fragment of correspondence language. In Section 3 we do the main technical work preparing the 'easy' direction of our generalization of Van Benthem modal characterization theorem and define our central notion of (generalized) asimulation. In Section 4 we do the technical work for the 'hard' direction which mainly revolves around the properties of asimulations over ω-saturated models. Section 5 contains the proof of the result itself, and Section 6 gives conclusions, discusses the limitations of the result presented and prospects for future research.

1 Preliminaries

We consider the correspondence language, which is a first-order language without identity over the vocabulary $\Sigma = \{ R_1^2, \dots R_n^2, \dots, P_1^1, \dots P_n^1, \dots \}$. A *formula* is a formula of the correspondence language. A model of the correspondence language is a classical first-order model of signature Σ. We refer to correspondence formulas with lower-case Greek letters θ, τ, φ, ψ, and χ, and to sets of correspondence formulas with upper-case Greek letters Γ and Δ.

We will use items from the following list to denote individual variables:

$$x_1, y_1, z_1, w_1, \dots, x_n, y_n, z_n, w_n, \dots$$

We will write x, y, z, w as a shorthand for x_1, y_1, z_1, w_1.

We denote the set of natural numbers by ω.

If φ is a correspondence formula, then we associate with it the following vocabulary $\Sigma_\varphi \subseteq \Sigma$ such that $\Sigma_\varphi = \{ R_1, \dots, R_n, \dots \} \cup \{ P_i \mid P_i \text{ occurs in } \varphi \}$. More generally, we refer with Θ to an arbitrary subset of Σ such that $\{ R_1, \dots, R_n, \dots \} \subseteq \Theta$. If ψ is a formula and every predicate letter occurring in ψ is in Θ, then we call ψ a Θ-formula.

We refer to a sequence $o_1, \dots, o_n$ of any objects as $\bar{o}_n$. We identify a sequence consisting of a single element with this element. If all free variables of a formula φ (formulas in Γ) occur in $\bar{x}_n$, we write $\varphi(\bar{x}_n)$ ($\Gamma(\bar{x}_n)$).

We use the following notation for models of classical predicate logic:

$$M = \langle U, \iota \rangle, M_1 = \langle U_1, \iota_1 \rangle, M_2 = \langle U_2, \iota_2 \rangle, \dots, M' = \langle U', \iota' \rangle, M'' = \langle U'', \iota'' \rangle, \dots,$$

where the first element of a model is its domain and the second element is its interpretation of predicate letters. If $k \in \omega$ then we write R_n^k as an abbreviation for $\iota_k(R_n)$. If $a \in U$ then we say that (M, a) is a pointed model. Further, we say that $\varphi(x)$ is true at (M, a) and write $M, a \models \varphi(x)$ iff for any variable assignment α in M such that $\alpha(x) = a$ we have $M, \alpha \models \varphi(x)$. It follows from this convention that the truth of a formula $\varphi(x)$ at a pointed model is to some extent independent from the choice of its only free variable. Moreover, for $k \in \omega$ we will sometimes write $a \models_k \varphi(x)$ instead of $M_k, a \models \varphi(x)$.

In what follows we will need a notion of *k-ary guarded x-connective* (k-ary x-g.c.) for a given variable x in the correspondence language. Such a connective is a formula $\varphi(x)$ of a special form, which we define inductively as follows:

1. $\mu = \psi(P_1(x), \dots, P_k(x))$ is a k-ary guarded x-connective of degree 0 iff $\psi(P_1(x), \dots, P_k(x))$ is a Boolean combination of $P_1(x), \dots, P_k(x)$, that is to say, a formula built from $P_1(x), \dots, P_k(x)$ using only $\wedge, \vee$, and $\neg$. In this case μ is neither $\forall$-guarded nor $\exists$-guarded.

2. If μ^- is a k-ary guarded x_{m+1}-connective of degree n, and μ^- is not $\forall$-guarded, then, for arbitrary $S_1, \dots, S_m \in \{ R_1, \dots, R_n, \dots \}$, formula

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}((\bigwedge_{i=1}^{m}(S_i(x_i, x_{i+1})) \to \mu^-) \qquad (\forall\text{-guard})$$

is a k-ary $\forall$-guarded x-connective of degree $n+1$, provided that it is not equivalent to a k-ary guarded x-connective of a smaller degree.

3. If μ^- is a k-ary guarded x_{m+1}-connective of degree n, and μ^- is not $\exists$-guarded, then, for arbitrary $S_1, \dots, S_m \in \{ R_1, \dots, R_n, \dots \}$, formula

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{m}(S_i(x_i, x_{i+1})) \wedge \mu^-) \qquad (\exists\text{-guard})$$

is a k-ary $\exists$-guarded x-connective of degree $n+1$, provided that it is not equivalent to a k-ary guarded x-connective of a smaller degree.

Thus degree of a k-ary x-g.c. is just the number of quantifier alternations in it. Degree of a k-ary x-g.c. μ we will abbreviate as $\delta(\mu)$. The modality μ^- mentioned in the above definition is called the immediate ancestor of μ. If $\delta(\mu) > 0$, then μ^- always exists, and, moreover, we have $\delta(\mu^-) = \delta(\mu) - 1$. Taking the transitive closure of immediate ancestry relation, we obtain that for every k-ary x-g.c. μ there exist $\delta(\mu)$ ancestors, which we will denote $\mu^0, \dots, \mu^{\delta(\mu)-1}$ respectively, assuming that in this sequence the x-g.c.'s with smaller superscripts are ancestors also of the x-g.c.'s with bigger superscripts, so that $\mu^- = \mu^{\delta(\mu)-1}$, $(\mu^-)^- = \mu^{\delta(\mu)-2}$, etc. In this sequence every μ^i is a guarded connective of degree i, so that μ^0 always defines a Boolean function for the corresponding set of atoms. For a given μ, we will call μ^0 the *propositional core* of μ.

Since in this paper we are interested in the expressive powers of guarded connectives, we will lump together different guarded connectives which are equivalent as formulas in the correspondence language, treating them as one and the same connective. In the same spirit, we are not going to distinguish between Boolean functions which are equivalent as formulas, and only differ from one another due to presence of vacuous variables. Thus every m-ary Boolean function under this angle of view *is* at the same time an n-ary Boolean function for $m \leq n$ for which $n - m$ extra variables are treated as vacuous.

Example 1. We list some examples of x-g.c.'s:

1. Standard connectives $\bot$, $\top$, $\neg$, $\wedge$, $\vee$, $\to$, $\leftrightarrow$ in their classical reading are all, when applied to $P_1(x)$ and $P_2(x)$, examples of x-g.c.'s of degree 0 and of corresponding arity.

2. Examples of unary $\forall$-guarded x-g.c.'s are:

$$\lambda_1 = \forall y(R_1(x,y) \to P_1(y));$$
$$\lambda_2 = \forall yz(R_1(x,y) \wedge R_2(y,z)) \to P_1(z));$$
$$\lambda_3 = \forall y(R_1(x,y) \to \exists z(R_3(y,z) \wedge P_1(z))).$$

The last of these g.c's has degree 2, the others have degree 1.

3. The following formula is an example of unary $\exists$-guarded x-g.c. of degree 1:

$$\lambda_4 = \exists y(R_1(x,y) \wedge P_1(y)).$$

4. Finally, an example of binary $\forall$-guarded x-g.c. of degree 1:

$$\lambda_5 = \forall y(R_1(x,y) \to (\neg P_1(y) \vee P_2(y))).$$

In what follows we will frequently encounter the long conjunctions similar to those in the definition of guarded connective above. Therefore, we introduce for them special notation. If $k < l$, $z_k, \ldots, z_{l+1}$ variables, and $S_k, \ldots, S_m \in \{ R_1, \ldots, R_n, \ldots \}$, then we abbreviate $\bigwedge_{i=k}^{l}(S_i(z_i, z_{i+1}))$ by $\pi_k^l Sz$. Similarly, if $c_k, \ldots, c_{l+1}$ is a sequence of elements of U_r, then we abbreviate $\bigwedge_{i=k}^{l}(\iota_r(S_i)(c_i, c_{i+1}))$ by $\pi_k^l S^r c$. In this notation, the above formulas ($\forall$-guard) and ($\exists$-guard) will look as

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \mu^-),$$

and

$$\exists x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \mu^-),$$

respectively.

It is obvious, that for natural r, s such that $r < s$, every r-ary x-g.c. is an s-ary x-g.c.

A guarded x-connective (x-g.c.) is a k-ary guarded x-connective for some $k \geq 0$.

If $\varphi_1(z), \ldots, \varphi_k(z)$ are formulas in the correspondence language, each with a single free variable, and μ is a k-ary x-g.c., then we call the *application of μ to $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k$* the result of replacing every formula in $P_1(w), \ldots, P_k(w)$ for some variable w in μ by formulas $\varphi_1(w), \ldots, \varphi_k(w)$, respectively, and we denote the resulting formula by $\mu(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_k)$.

If x is a variable in the correspondence language, then we say that the set $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ of formulas in variable x is a *guarded x-fragment* of the correspondence language iff $\mathbb{M}$ is a set of x-g.c's and $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ is the least set of Θ-formulas, such that $P_n(x) \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ for every $P_n \in \Theta$, and $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ is closed under applications of x-g.c's from $\mathbb{M}$. If $\mathbb{M} = \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_s\}$ is a finite set of x-g.c.'s, then we write $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ as $\mathcal{L}_x(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_s)$.

Example 2. We list some examples of guarded x-fragments using the notation of the previous example:

1. $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Sigma}(\wedge, \vee, \bot, \top, \lambda_5)$ is the set of all standard x-translations of propositional intuitionistic formulas.

2. $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Sigma}(\wedge, \vee, \bot, \top, \neg, \lambda_1, \lambda_4)$ is the set of all standard x-translations of propositional modal formulas.

3. $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Sigma}(\wedge, \vee, \bot, \top, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_5)$ is the set of all standard x-translations of propositional modal intuitionistic formulas, in case we assume for intuitionistic modal logic the type of Kripke semantics defined by clauses $(\Box_2)$ and $(\Diamond_2)$ of [1, Section 4].

2 Standard fragments and classification of Boolean functions

In this paper we are interested in characterizing the expressive powers of guarded x-fragments $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ of the correspondence language, such that $\{\wedge, \vee, \top, \bot\} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$, by means of an invariance with respect to a suitable class of binary relations. Therefore, we need to define the respective type of invariance property:

Definition 1. Let α be a class of relations such that for any $A \in \alpha$ there is a Θ and there are Θ-models M_1 and M_2 such that the following condition holds:

$$A \subseteq (U_1 \times U_2) \cup (U_2 \times U_1) \qquad \text{(type)}$$

Then a formula $\varphi(x)$ is said to be *invariant with respect to* α, iff for every $A \in \alpha$ for the corresponding Θ-models M_1 and M_2, and for arbitrary $a \in U_1$ and $b \in U_2$ it is true that:

$$(a \; A \; b \wedge a \models_1 \varphi(x)) \Rightarrow b \models_2 \varphi(x).$$

The above definition defines formula invariance under rather special conditions. However, these conditions will hold for all the binary relations to be considered below, therefore this definition suits our purposes.

If a formula is invariant w.r.t. a singleton $\{A\}$, we simply say that a formula is invariant w.r.t. A. Clearly, a formula is invariant w.r.t. a class α iff this formula is invariant w.r.t. every $A \in \alpha$. We say that a set $\Gamma(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. α iff every formula in $\Gamma(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. α.

Our purpose in the present paper, therefore, is to give an algorithm which, for a given guarded x-fragment $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ of the correspondence language would compute a definition of a class of binary relations such that a formula $\psi(x)$ of the correspondence language is equivalent to a formula in $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ iff it is invariant w.r.t. this class. Members of the respective classes of binary relations we will call *asimulations*.

However, one can expect that not all guarded fragments are equally amenable to such a treatment. Therefore, the rest of this section is devoted to isolating some special well-behaved subsets of the class of guarded connectives. The guarded fragments generated by such well-behaved subsets we are going to designate as 'standard' ones and claim them as the proper scope of the general algorithm mentioned in the previous paragraph.

The definition of a guarded connective suggests 2 natural rubrics for their classification, the one according to their degree and the other according to the type of Boolean function defined by their propositional core. We are now going to look closer into the latter.

First let us mention the natural order on the doubleton set of classical truth values: $0 < 1$. This order induces the natural order on the n-tuples of truth values for which we have $\bar{a}_n \leq \bar{b}_n$ iff for every i between 1 and n we have $a_i \leq b_i$ as truth values. We now define the following types of Boolean functions:

1. *Monotone* functions. A Boolean n-ary function f is monotone iff for all n-tuples of truth values $\bar{a}_n$ and $\bar{b}_n$ we have

$$\bar{a}_n \leq \bar{b}_n \Rightarrow f(\bar{a}_n) \leq f(\bar{b}_n).$$

2. *Anti-monotone* functions. A Boolean n-ary function f is anti-monotone iff for all n-tuples of truth values $\bar{a}_n$ and $\bar{b}_n$ we have

$$\bar{a}_n \leq \bar{b}_n \Rightarrow f(\bar{a}_n) \geq f(\bar{b}_n).$$

3. *Rest* functions. A Boolean function is a rest function iff it is neither monotone nor anti-monotone.

4. TFT-functions. A Boolean n-ary function f is a TFT-function iff there exist three n-tuples of truth values $\bar{a}_n$, $\bar{b}_n$, and $\bar{c}_n$ such that (1) $\bar{a}_n < \bar{b}_n < \bar{c}_n$, and (2) $f(\bar{a}_n) = f(\bar{c}_n) = 1$, whereas $f(\bar{b}_n) = 0$.

5. FTF-functions. A Boolean n-ary function f is an FTF-function iff there exist three n-tuples of truth values $\bar{a}_n$, $\bar{b}_n$, and $\bar{c}_n$ such that (1) $\bar{a}_n < \bar{b}_n < \bar{c}_n$, and (2) $f(\bar{a}_n) = f(\bar{c}_n) = 0$, whereas $f(\bar{b}_n) = 1$.

Note that under this reading the class of monotone functions has a non-empty intersection with the class of anti-monotone functions, which consists of constant functions. Further, note that all TFT-functions and FTF functions are *ex definitione* rest functions. The rest functions which are *not* TFT-functions we will call $\forall$-*special*. Similarly, the rest functions which are *not* FTF-functions we will call $\exists$-*special*.[2] Further, Boolean functions (not necessarily rest functions) which are *not* FTF-functions we will call *weakly* $\exists$-*special*, whereas Boolean functions (again, not necessarily rest functions) which are *not* TFT-functions we will call *weakly* $\forall$-*special*. Thus, every non-rest function is both weakly $\forall$-special and weakly $\exists$-special.

Before we go any further, we need to introduce a more convenient notation for subclasses of guarded connectives which emphasizes both the structure of their quantifier prefix and the type of their propositional core. Classes of x-g.c.'s will be denoted by expressions of the form $\nu_x(Q_1 \ldots Q_k, f)$ where f is a Boolean function and $Q_1 \ldots Q_k$ is a possibly empty sequence of alternating quantifiers from the set $\{\forall, \exists\}$. Thus, $\nu_x(\emptyset, f)$ denotes a class of all x-g.c.'s of degree 0 which define a Boolean function f

[2] A rest function can be neither $\forall$- nor $\exists$-special. Take, for instance, $p_1 \leftrightarrow p_2 \leftrightarrow p_3$ and consider the following series of tuples:

$$(0,0,0) < (1,0,0) < (1,1,0) < (1,1,1).$$

However, it is impossible for a rest function to be both $\forall$-special and $\exists$-special. Indeed, if f is a rest function then take $\bar{a}_n$, $\bar{b}_n$, $\bar{c}_n$, $\bar{d}_n$ such that $\bar{a}_n < \bar{b}_n$ and $\bar{c}_n < \bar{d}_n$ for which we have

$$f(\bar{a}_n) = f(\bar{d}_n) = 0; f(\bar{b}_n) = f(\bar{c}_n) = 1.$$

Since $f(\bar{a}_n) \neq f(\bar{c}_n)$, we must have $\bar{a}_n \neq \bar{c}_n$. Therefore, if $\bar{a}_n$ and $\bar{c}_n$ are comparable, then we must have either $\bar{a}_n < \bar{c}_n$ or $\bar{c}_n < \bar{a}_n$. In the former case the sequence $(\bar{a}_n, \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n)$ shows that f is an FTF-function, whereas in the latter case the sequence $(\bar{c}_n, \bar{a}_n, \bar{b}_n)$ shows that f is a TFT-function. Finally, if $\bar{a}_n$ and $\bar{c}_n$ are incomparable, one has to consider $\bar{e}_n = min(\bar{a}_n, \bar{c}_n)$. We must have then $\bar{e}_n < \bar{a}_n, \bar{c}_n$, and, depending on the value of $f(\bar{e}_n)$, we get that either the sequence $(\bar{e}_n, \bar{c}_n, \bar{d}_n)$ verifies that f is an FTF-function or the sequence $(\bar{e}_n, \bar{a}_n, \bar{b}_n)$ verifies that f is a TFT-function.

for their atomic components. If the meaning of $\nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k, f)$ is already defined, and $Q \in \{\forall, \exists\}$ is such that $Q \neq Q_1$, we further define that $\nu_x(QQ_1 \dots Q_k, f)$ is the class of all Q-guarded x-g.c.'s μ for which we have $\mu^- \in \nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k, f)$.

One has to note that at least in case of constants this notation can be misleading since we have for example

$$\nu_x(\forall, \top) = \{\top\}; \nu_x(\exists, \bot) = \{\bot\},$$

and thus these two classes are not actually classes of g.c.'s of degree 1. And in general the classes $\nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k \exists, \bot)$ and $\nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k \forall, \top)$ always coincide with the classes $\nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k, \bot)$ and $\nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k, \top)$, respectively. Therefore, we omit classes of the forms $\nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k \exists, \bot)$ and $\nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k \forall, \top)$ from our classification.

This phenomenon, however, does not seem to arise with the other pieces of the introduced notation: for guarded connectives with non-constant f the length of quantifier prefix in $\nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k, f)$ is precisely the same as the degree of the elements of $\nu_x(Q_1 \dots Q_k, f)$ and different such ν's denote different and disjoint classes of guarded connectives.[3] This is certainly so for the classes of guarded connectives of degree not exceeding 2 which will mostly concern us below.

With this ν-notation, we can provide a concise description for further important subclasses of guarded connectives. We define that an x-g.c. μ is *special* iff for some variable x, μ is in the class $\nu_x(Q, f)$ and f is Q-special. Moreover, we define, that an x-g.c. μ is *weakly special* iff $\mu \in \nu_x(Q, f)$ and f is weakly Q-special.

We now want to designate the following special classes of guarded connectives:

1. *Flat connectives* are guarded connectives of degree less or equal to 1.
2. *Modalities* are guarded connectives with a propositional core, defining a non-constant Boolean function which is either monotone or anti-monotone.
3. *Regular connectives* are guarded connectives with a weakly special ancestor of degree 1 and a non-constant propositional core.

It is easy to see that these three classes have pairwise non-empty intersection. For example, the intersection of flat connectives and regular connectives is the class of all weakly special connectives, and given that propositional cores of modalities are both weakly $\forall$-special and weakly $\exists$-special, we get that every modality is regular.

Before we turn to the definition of a standard fragment, we collect some facts about Boolean functions:

Lemma 1. *Let $f(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ be a Boolean function. Then:*

1. *If f is non-constant monotone, then it is expressible as $F(p_1, \dots, p_n)$, where F is a superposition of $\wedge$'s and $\vee$'s.*
2. *If f is non-constant monotone, then $f(p_1, \dots, p_1)$ is just p_1.*
3. *If f is non-constant anti-monotone, then it is expressible as $\neg F(p_1, \dots, p_n)$, where F is a superposition of $\wedge$'s and $\vee$'s.*

[3] The only possible difficulty seems to concern the vacuous arguments of Boolean functions. We avoid this by lumping together Boolean functions defined by logical equivalents.

4. *If f is non-constant anti-monotone, then $f(p_1, \ldots, p_1)$ is just $\neg p_1$.*

5. *If f is a TFT-function, then, for some $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \{p_1, p_2, p_1 \vee p_2, \bot, \top\}$, $f(A_1, \ldots, A_n)$ is equivalent to $p_1 \to p_2$.*

6. *If f is an FTF-function, then, for some $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \{p_1, p_2, p_1 \wedge p_2, \bot, \top\}$, $f(A_1, \ldots, A_n)$ is equivalent to $p_1 \wedge \neg p_2$.*

7. *If f is a rest function, then for some $B_1, \ldots, B_n, C_1, \ldots, C_n \in \{p_1, \bot, \top\}$ we have both $f(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$ equivalent to p_1 and $f(C_1, \ldots, C_n)$ equivalent to $\neg p_1$.*

8. *If f is a non-constant non-FTF function, then f admits of representation in the following form:*

   $$(p_1^1\wedge, \ldots, \wedge p_{i_1}^1)\vee, \ldots, \vee(p_1^k\wedge, \ldots, \wedge p_{i_k}^k)\vee(\neg q_1^1\wedge, \ldots, \wedge\neg q_{j_1}^1)\vee, \ldots, \vee(\neg q_1^m\wedge, \ldots, \wedge\neg q_{j_m}^m)$$

   where $m, k \geq 0$, $m + k > 0$, $i_1, \ldots, i_k, j_1, \ldots, j_m > 0$ and

   $$p_1^1, \ldots, p_{i_1}^1, \ldots, p_1^k, \ldots, p_{i_k}^k, q_1^1, \ldots, q_{j_1}^1 \in \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}.$$

9. *If f is a non-constant non-TFT function, then f admits of representation in the following form:*

   $$(p_1^1\vee, \ldots, \vee p_{i_1}^1)\wedge, \ldots, \wedge(p_1^k\vee, \ldots, \vee p_{i_k}^k)\wedge(\neg q_1^1\vee, \ldots, \vee\neg q_{j_1}^1)\wedge, \ldots, \wedge(\neg q_1^m\vee, \ldots, \vee\neg q_{j_m}^m)$$

   where $m, k \geq 0$, $m + k > 0$, $i_1, \ldots, i_k, j_1, \ldots, j_m > 0$ and

   $$p_1^1, \ldots, p_{i_1}^1, \ldots, p_1^k, \ldots, p_{i_k}^k, q_1^1, \ldots, q_{j_1}^1 \in \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}.$$

Proof. Parts 1 through 4 are all just known basic facts about Boolean functions. We concentrate on the parts 5 through 9.

As for Part 5, assume that f is a TFT-function. Then (renumbering p's if necessary) for some $1 \leq k < l < m \leq n$ we must have all of the following:

$$(p_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge p_{k-1} \wedge \neg p_k \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_n) \to f(p_1, \ldots, p_n); \quad (1)$$

$$(p_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge p_l \wedge \neg p_{l+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_n) \to \neg f(p_1, \ldots, p_n); \quad (2)$$

$$(p_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge p_m \wedge \neg p_{m+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_n) \to f(p_1, \ldots, p_n). \quad (3)$$

We have then one of the two cases: either

$$(p_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge p_{k-1} \wedge \neg p_k \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_l \wedge p_{l+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge p_m \wedge \neg p_{m+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_n) \to f(p_1, \ldots, p_1),$$

or

$$(p_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge p_{k-1} \wedge \neg p_k \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_l \wedge p_{l+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge p_m \wedge \neg p_{m+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_n) \to \neg f(p_1, \ldots, p_1).$$

In the first case we set as follows:

$$A_1, \ldots, A_{k-1} := \top;$$

$$A_k, \ldots, A_l := p_1;$$

$$A_{l+1}, \ldots, A_m := p_2;$$
$$A_{m+1}, \ldots, A_n := \bot.$$

In the second case the settings are as follows:

$$A_1, \ldots, A_{k-1} := \top;$$
$$A_k, \ldots, A_l := p_1 \vee p_2;$$
$$A_{l+1}, \ldots, A_m := p_1;$$
$$A_{m+1}, \ldots, A_n := \bot.$$

One can straightforwardly verify then, that in each of the two cases the respective settings for $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ give us

$$f(A_1, \ldots, A_n) \Leftrightarrow p_1 \to p_2.$$

Part 6 is just a dual of Part 5.

As for Part 7, assume that f is a rest function, that is, f is neither monotone nor anti-monotone. This means that (renaming p's if necessary) there exist $1 \leq k < l \leq n$ and also $1 \leq k' < l' \leq n$ for which all of the following holds:

$$(p_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge p_{k-1} \wedge \neg p_k \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_n) \to f(p_1, \ldots, p_n); \quad (4)$$
$$(p_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge p_l \wedge \neg p_{l+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_n) \to \neg f(p_1, \ldots, p_1); \quad (5)$$
$$(p_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge p_{k'-1} \wedge \neg p_{k'} \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_n) \to \neg f(p_1, \ldots, p_1). \quad (6)$$
$$(p_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge p_{l'} \wedge \neg p_{l'+1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \neg p_n) \to f(p_1, \ldots, p_1); \quad (7)$$

We get then the equivalencies required by Lemma setting as follows:

$$B_1, \ldots, B_{k'-1} := \top;$$
$$B_{k'}, \ldots, B_{l'} := p_1;$$
$$B_{l'+1}, \ldots, B_n := \bot;$$
$$C_1, \ldots, C_{k-1} := \top;$$
$$C_k, \ldots, C_l := p_1;$$
$$C_{l+1}, \ldots, C_n := \bot.$$

As for Part 8, assume that f is a non-constant non-FTF Boolean function. Then consider the n-tuples of values of $\bar{p}_n$ for which f is true (T-tuples for f). Since f is non-FTF, then no such tuple can be both below and above some tuple for which n is false (some F-tuple for f) in terms of our induced order among tuples of Boolean values. Therefore we divide all the T-tuples for f into two subsets: (1) lower T-tuples, which are below some F-tuple but not above any F-tuple; and (2) upper T-tuples, which are above some F-tuple but not below any F-tuple. We now set k to be the number of minimal upper T-tuples for f and and m to be the number of maximal lower T-tuples for f. Since f is non-constant, we will obviously have both some T-tuples and some F-tuples for f, therefore we get that $m + k > 0$, even though m or k can turn out to be 0. We now set for $g \leq k$ that $p_1^g, \ldots, p_{i_g}^g$ is the set of all variables from $\bar{p}_n$ which

are true in the g-th minimal upper T-tuple, while for $h \leq m$ we set that $q^h_1, \ldots, q^h_{j_h}$ is the set of all variables from $\bar{p}_n$ which are false in the h-th maximal lower T-tuple.

One straightforwardly verifies that these settings give us the desired representation for f.

Part 9 is just a dual of Part 8. □

Now, a guarded x-fragment $\mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})$ we call a *standard x-fragment* iff $\mathbb{M}$ is a finite set of flat connectives plus some regular connectives of degree 2. The guarded connectives used to generate standard fragments of the correspondence language we will also call standard connectives.

It is easy to see, that every x-g.c. listed in Example 1 above except for λ_3 is a binary flat connective, and that every x-g.c. from the same Example except for λ_5 is a modality. Therefore, given the degrees of these x-g.c.'s, every guarded x-fragment of the correspondence language listed in Example 3 is a standard x-fragment.

3 Asimulations

In order to define asimulations we first need to define some special classes of tuples of binary relations. So let M_1, M_2 be Θ-models. We then denote the set of binary relations satisfying condition (type) for the given M_1, M_2 by $W(M_1, M_2)$. Further, for a set $\Gamma(x)$ of Θ-formulas we define $Rel(\Gamma(x), M_1, M_2)$ to be the set of all $A \in W(M_1, M_2)$, such that $\Gamma(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. A.

First, we need to handle the propositional cores of guarded connectives. We bring Boolean functions into correspondence with the above defined operations on sets of the form $\beta \subseteq W(M_1, M_2)$ in the following way:

$$[f(p_1, \ldots, p_n)](\beta) = \begin{cases} W(M_1, M_2) & \text{if } f \text{ is constant;} \\ \beta & \text{if } f \text{ is non-constant monotone;} \\ \beta^{-1} & \text{if } f \text{ is non-constant anti-monotone;} \\ \beta \cap \beta^{-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the above definition, we assume that:

$$\beta^{-1} = \{R^{-1} \mid R \in \beta\},$$

and that:

$$\beta \cap \beta^{-1} = \{R \cap R^{-1} \mid R \in \beta\}.$$

Now we can define operations of the form $[\mu](\beta)$, where μ is a binary x-g.c. and $\beta \subseteq W(M_1, M_2)$. These operations are defined for subsets of $W(M_1, M_2)$, and return the subsets of $W^{n+1}(M_1, M_2)$, where $n = \delta(\mu)$. We define the operations by induction on the degree of x-g.c. μ.

Basis. If $\delta(\mu) = 0$, then we stipulate that

$$[\mu](\beta) = [f](\beta),$$

where f is the binary Boolean function defined by $\psi(P_1(x), \ldots, P_n(x))$ for $P_1(x), \ldots, P_n(x)$.

Induction step. If $\delta(\mu) = n + 1$ and μ is $\forall$-guarded, then we distinguish between two cases:

Case 1. If μ is not special, then we have $\mu = \forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \mu^-)$ in the assumptions of (∀-guard). We define $[\mu](\beta)$ as the set of tuples of the form $\langle A_1, \dots, A_{\delta(\mu)+1}\rangle$, such that $\langle A_1, \dots, A_{\delta(\mu)}\rangle \in [\mu^-](\beta)$ and $A_{\delta(\mu)+1}$ satisfies the following condition for all natural r, t such that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$:

$$(\forall a_1 \in U_r)(\forall \bar{b}_{m+1} \in U_t)(a_1\ A_{\delta(\mu)+1}\ b_1 \wedge \pi_1^m S^t b) \Rightarrow \\ \Rightarrow \exists a_2 \dots a_{m+1} \in U_r(\pi_1^m S^r a \wedge a_{m+1}\ A_{\delta(\mu)}\ b_{m+1}) \qquad \text{(back)}$$

Case 2. If μ is special, then we define $[\mu](\beta)$ as the set of couples of the form $\langle B, A\rangle$, such that $B \in \beta$ and $A \in W(M_1, M_2)$ satisfies the following condition for all natural r, t such that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$:

$$(\forall a_1 \in U_r)(\forall \bar{b}_{m+1} \in U_t)(a_1\ A\ b_1 \wedge \pi_1^m S^t b) \Rightarrow \\ \Rightarrow (\exists a_2 \dots a_{m+1} \in U_r(\pi_1^m S^r a \wedge a_{m+1}\ B\ b_{m+1}) \wedge \\ \wedge \exists c_2 \dots c_{m+1} \in U_r(\iota_r(S_1)(a_1, c_2) \wedge \pi_2^m S^r c \wedge c_{m+1}\ B^{-1}\ b_{m+1})) \quad \text{(s-back)}$$

Finally, if $\delta(\mu) = n + 1$ and μ is ∃-guarded, we again have two cases.

Case 3. If μ is not special, then we have $\mu = \exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \mu^-)$ in the assumptions of (∃-guard). We define $[\mu](\beta)$ as the set of tuples of the form $\langle A_1, \dots, A_{\delta(\mu)+1}\rangle$, such that $\langle A_1, \dots, A_{\delta(\mu)}\rangle \in [\mu^-](\beta)$ and $A_{\delta(\mu)+1}$ satisfies the following condition for all natural r, t such that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$:

$$(\forall \bar{a}_{m+1} \in U_r)(\forall b_1 \in U_t)(a_1\ A_{\delta(\mu)+1}\ b_1 \wedge \pi_1^m S^r a) \Rightarrow \\ \Rightarrow \exists b_2 \dots b_{m+1} \in U_t(\pi_1^m S^t b \wedge a_{m+1}\ A_{\delta(\mu)}\ b_{m+1}) \qquad \text{(forth)}$$

Case 4. If μ is special, then we define $[\mu](\beta)$ as the set of couples of the form $\langle B, A\rangle$, such that $B \in \beta$ and $A \in W(M_1, M_2)$ satisfies the following condition for all natural r, t such that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$:

$$(\forall \bar{a}_{m+1} \in U_r)(\forall b_1 \in U_t)(a_1\ A\ b_1 \wedge \pi_1^m S^r a) \Rightarrow \\ \Rightarrow (\exists b_2 \dots b_{m+1} \in U_t(\pi_1^m S^t b \wedge a_{m+1}\ B\ b_{m+1}) \wedge \\ \wedge \exists c_2 \dots c_{m+1} \in U_t(\iota_t(S_1)(b_1, c_2) \wedge \pi_2^m S^t c \wedge a_{m+1}\ B^{-1}\ c_{m+1})) \quad \text{(s-forth)}$$

We now prove an important lemma about the defined operations:

Lemma 2. *Let $\varphi(x)$ be logically equivalent to $\mu(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)$, where μ is an arbitrary x-g.c. Then, if $\beta \subseteq Rel(\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n\}, M_1, M_2)$ for some models M_1 and M_2, then $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. to the set*

$$\{A_{\delta(\mu)+1} \mid \exists A_1, \dots, A_{\delta(\mu)}(\langle A_1, \dots, A_{\delta(\mu)+1}\rangle \in [\mu](\beta))\}.$$

Proof. We argue by induction on $\delta(\mu)$.

Basis. Assume $\delta(\mu) = 0$. Then $\varphi(x)$ is logically equivalent to $\psi(\psi_1(x), \dots, \psi_n(x))$, where ψ induces some Boolean f on $\psi_1(x), \dots, \psi_n(x)$. Therefore, we need to show that $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. every relation in $[\mu](\beta)$. We then have to distinguish between the following 4 cases:

Case 1. f is constant. Then $[\mu](\beta) = W(M_1, M_2)$ and $\varphi(x)$ is either equivalent to $\top$ or to $\bot$. Obviously, $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. any relation in $W(M_1, M_2)$

Case 2. f is non-constant monotone. Then $[\mu](\beta) = \beta$. Since $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n$ are invariant w.r.t. β, it is obvious that $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. $[\mu](\beta) = \beta$ as well.

Case 3. f is non-constant anti-monotone. Then $[\mu](\beta) = \beta^{-1}$. Since, by the assumption of the lemma, $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n$ are invariant w.r.t. to β, then, by contraposition, $\neg\psi_1, \ldots, \neg\psi_n$ are invariant w.r.t. every inverse of a relation from β. Therefore, $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. $[\mu](\beta) = \beta^{-1}$.

Case 4. f is a rest function, that is to say, neither monotone nor anti-monotone. Then $[\mu](\beta) = \beta \cap \beta^{-1}$. If $A \in \beta \cap \beta^{-1}$, then by assumption of the lemma and contraposition we have both that $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n$ are invariant w.r.t. A and $\neg\psi_1, \ldots, \neg\psi_n$ are invariant w.r.t. A. Therefore every Boolean combination of $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n$ is also invariant w.r.t. A. Since A was chosen arbitrarily, this means that $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. $[\mu](\beta)$.

Induction step. Assume $\delta(\mu) = k + 1$. We then have to distinguish between the following 4 cases:

Case 1. If μ is $\forall$-guarded and not special, then $\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)$ and thus $\varphi(x)$ is equivalent to a formula $\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m S x \to \mu^-)$ under the assumptions of ($\forall$-guard). Assume that $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu)+1}\rangle$ is in $[\mu](\beta)$. Then we also have that $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu)}\rangle$ is in $[\mu^-](\beta)$.

Now, assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$, $a_1 \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ A_{\delta(\mu)+1}\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that

$$a_1 \models_r \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n). \tag{8}$$

Then let $b_2 \ldots b_{m+1} \in U_t$ be such that

$$\pi_1^m S^t b. \tag{9}$$

Then, by condition (back) there exist $a_2 \ldots a_{m+1} \in U_r$ such that:

$$\pi_1^m S^r a, \tag{10}$$

and

$$a_{m+1}\ A_{\delta(\mu)}\ b_{m+1}. \tag{11}$$

By (8) and (10) we know that

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n). \tag{12}$$

By (11), the fact that $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu)}\rangle \in [\mu^-](\beta)$ and induction hypothesis, we have

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n). \tag{13}$$

Since $b_2 \ldots b_{m+1}$ were chosen arbitrarily under the condition (9), we get that $b_1 \models_t \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)$, and thus we are done.

Case 2. Assume that μ is $\forall$-guarded and special. Then we have $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall, f)$, and f, being $\forall$-special, is not a TFT-function. Also, $\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)$ is equivalent to

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m S x \to \psi(\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

where ψ induces f for $\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})$.

Let $\langle B, A\rangle \in [\mu](\beta)$ and assume that $\{r,t\} = \{1,2\}$, $a_1 \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ A\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that

$$a_1 \models_r \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n). \tag{14}$$

Then let $b_2 \ldots b_{m+1} \in U_t$ be such that

$$\pi_1^m S^t b. \tag{15}$$

Then, by condition (s-back) there exist $a_2 \ldots a_{m+1} \in U_r$ such that:

$$\pi_1^m S^r a, \tag{16}$$

and

$$a_{m+1}\ B\ b_{m+1}. \tag{17}$$

Moreover, by the same condition there exist $c_2 \ldots c_{m+1} \in U_r$ such that:

$$\iota_r(S_1)(a_1, c_2) \wedge \pi_2^m S^r c \tag{18}$$

and

$$c_{m+1}\ B^{-1}\ b_{m+1}. \tag{19}$$

By (14) and (16) we know that

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \psi(\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})), \tag{20}$$

that is to say, that the n-tuple $\bar{\alpha}_n$ of Boolean values induced by $\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})$ on (M_r, a_{m+1}), verifies function f.

Further, by (14) and (18) we know that

$$c_{m+1} \models_r \psi(\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})), \tag{21}$$

that is to say, that the n-tuple $\bar{\gamma}_n$ of Boolean values induced by $\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})$ on (M_r, c_{m+1}), verifies function f.

Now, let $\bar{\eta}_n$ be the n-tuple of Boolean values induced by $\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})$ on (M_t, b_{m+1}). By (17), (19), and the fact that $B \in \beta \subseteq Rel(\{\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n\}, M_1, M_2)$, we know that

$$\bar{\alpha}_n \leq \bar{\eta}_n \leq \bar{\gamma}_n.$$

Therefore, by (20), (21), and the fact that f is not a TFT-function, we must have that:

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \psi(\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})). \tag{22}$$

Since $b_2 \ldots b_{m+1}$ were chosen arbitrarily under the condition (15), we get that $b_1 \models_t \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)$, and thus we are done.

Case 3. If μ is $\exists$-guarded and not special, then $\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)$ and thus $\varphi(x)$ is equivalent to a formula $\exists x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m S x \wedge \mu^-)$ under the assumptions of ($\exists$-guard). Assume that $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu)+1}\rangle$ is in $[\mu](\beta)$. Then we also have that $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu)}\rangle$ is in $[\mu^-](\beta)$.

Now, assume that $\{r,t\} = \{1,2\}$, $a_1 \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ A_{\delta(\mu)+1}\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that

$$a_1 \models_r \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n). \tag{23}$$

Then let $a_2 \ldots a_{m+1} \in U_r$ be such that

$$\pi_1^m S^r a, \tag{24}$$

and

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n). \tag{25}$$

Then, by condition (forth), there exist $b_2 \ldots b_{m+1} \in U_t$ such that

$$\pi_1^m S^t b, \tag{26}$$

and

$$a_{m+1}\ A_{\delta(\mu)}\ b_{m+1}. \tag{27}$$

By (27), the fact that $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu)}\rangle \in [\mu^-](\beta)$ and induction hypothesis, we have

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n). \tag{28}$$

Therefore, by (26) and (28), we get that $b_1 \models_t \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)$, and thus we are done.

Case 4. Assume that μ is $\exists$-guarded and special. Then we have $\mu \in \nu_x(\exists, f)$, and f, being $\exists$-special, is not an FTF-function. Also, $\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)$ is equivalent to

$$\exists x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \psi(\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

where ψ induces f for $\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})$.

Let $\langle B, A\rangle \in [\mu](\beta)$ and assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$, $a_1 \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ A\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that

$$a_1 \models_r \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n). \tag{29}$$

Then one can choose $a_2 \ldots a_{m+1} \in U_r$ such that

$$\pi_1^m S^r a, \tag{30}$$

and

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \psi(\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})). \tag{31}$$

Therefore, we know that the n-tuple $\bar{\eta}_n$ of Boolean values induced by $\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})$ on (M_r, a_{m+1}), verifies function f.

But then, by condition (s-forth) there exist $b_2 \ldots b_{m+1} \in U_t$ such that:

$$\pi_1^m S^t b, \tag{32}$$

and

$$a_{m+1}\ B\ b_{m+1}. \tag{33}$$

Moreover, by the same condition there exist $c_2 \ldots c_{m+1} \in U_t$ such that:

$$\iota_t(S_1)(b_1, c_2) \wedge \pi_2^m S^t c \tag{34}$$

and

$$a_{m+1}\ B^{-1}\ c_{m+1}. \tag{35}$$

Now, let $\bar{\alpha}_n$ and $\bar{\beta}_n$ be the n-tuples of Boolean values induced by $\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})$ on (M_t, b_{m+1}) and (M_t, c_{m+1}) respectively. By (33), (35), and the fact that $B \in \beta \subseteq Rel(\{\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n\}, M_1, M_2)$, we know that

$$\bar{\beta}_n \leq \bar{\eta}_n \leq \bar{\alpha}_n.$$

Therefore, since f is not an FTF-function, we know that at least one of the tuples $\bar{\alpha}_n$, $\bar{\beta}_n$ verifies f. Whence we have either

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \psi(\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})), \tag{36}$$

or

$$c_{m+1} \models_t \psi(\psi_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi_n(x_{m+1})). \tag{37}$$

In both cases, using either (32) or (34), we get that $b_1 \models_t \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)$, and thus we are done. □

We are now ready to define asimulations, the central notion of this paper.

Definition 2. *Let $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_s)$ be a guarded x-fragment of the correspondence language and let M_1, M_2 be Θ-models. A non-empty relation $A \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\emptyset), M_1, M_2)$ is an* $(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$-asimulation *iff for every i such that $1 \leq i \leq s$ there exist $A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu_i)}$ such that*

$$\langle A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu_i)}, A\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\}).$$

The fact that A is an $(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$-asimulation we will abbreviate by $A \in A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$.

Example 3. In the notation of the two examples given in the previous section, we get as a result of above definition, that for any two given models M_1 and M_2:

1. The set $A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Sigma}(\wedge, \vee, \bot, \top, \lambda_5), M_1, M_2)$ is the set of all asimulations between M_1 and M_2 as defined in [6].
2. The set $A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Sigma}(\wedge, \vee, \bot, \top, \neg, \lambda_1, \lambda_4), M_1, M_2)$ is the set of all bisimulations between M_1 and M_2.
3. The set $A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Sigma}(\wedge, \vee, \bot, \top, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_5), M_1, M_2)$ is the set of all relations A for which there exists a relation B such that $\langle A, B\rangle$ is a $(2,2)$-modal asimulation between M_1 and M_2 as defined in [8, Definition 5].

With the help of Definition 2, we obtain one part of our characterization as a corollary of Lemma 2:

Corollary 1. *Let $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_s)$ be a guarded x-fragment of the correspondence language and let M_1, M_2 be Θ-models. If $A \in A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$ and $\varphi(x)$ is logically equivalent to a formula in $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, then $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. A.*

Proof. Assume that $\varphi(x)$ is equivalent to a formula in $\psi(x) \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$. We argue by induction on the construction of $\psi(x)$. If, for some $P_n \in \Theta$, $\psi(x)$ is $P_n(x)$, then $\psi(x)$ (and therefore $\varphi(x)$) is invariant w.r.t. A, since $A \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\emptyset), M_1, M_2)$.

If, for some i, such that $1 \leq i \leq s$, $\psi(x)$ is of the form $\mu_i(\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_n)$, then there exist $A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu_i)}$ such that

$$\langle A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu_i)}, A\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\}).$$

By induction hypothesis, we know that $A \in Rel(\{\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_n\}, M_1, M_2)$. Therefore, setting $\beta := \{A\}$ in Lemma 2, we get that $\varphi(x)$, being equivalent to $\mu_i(\chi_1, , \ldots, \chi_n)$, is invariant w.r.t. A. □

We note that Corollary 1 applies to arbitrary guarded fragments rather than to just standard ones and is therefore much stronger than the 'easy', left-to-right direction of our main result, Theorem 1.

4 Asimulations over saturated models

To proceed, we need to introduce some further notions and results from classical model theory. For a Θ-model M and $\bar{a}_n \in U$, let $M/\bar{a}_n$ be the extension of M with $\bar{a}_n$ as new individual constants interpreted as themselves. It is easy to see that there is a simple relation between the truth of a formula at a sequence of elements of a Θ-model and the truth of its substitution instance in an extension of the above-mentioned kind; namely, for any Θ-model M, any Θ-formula $\varphi(\bar{y}_n, \bar{w}_m)$ and any $\bar{a}_n, \bar{b}_m \in U$ it is true that:

$$(M/\bar{a}_n), \bar{b}_m \models \varphi(\bar{a}_n, \bar{w}_m) \Leftrightarrow M, \bar{a}_n, \bar{b}_m \models \varphi(\bar{y}_n, \bar{w}_m).$$

We will call a theory of M (and write $Th(M)$) the set of all first-order sentences true at M. We will call an n-type of M a set of formulas $\Gamma(\bar{w}_n)$ consistent with $Th(M)$.

Definition 3. *Let M be a Θ-model. M is* ω-saturated *iff for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $\bar{a}_n \in U$, every k-type $\Gamma(\bar{w}_k)$ of $M/\bar{a}_n$ is satisfiable in $M/\bar{a}_n$.*

Definition of ω-saturation normally requires satisfiability of 1-types only. However, our modification is equivalent to the more familiar version: see e.g. [5, Lemma 4.31, p. 73].

It is known that every model can be elementarily extended to an ω-saturated model; in other words, the following lemma holds:

Lemma 3. *Let M be a Θ-model. Then there is an ω-saturated extension M' of M such that for all $\bar{a}_n \in U$ and every Θ-formula $\varphi(\bar{w}_n)$:*

$$M, \bar{a}_n \models \varphi(\bar{w}_n) \Leftrightarrow M', \bar{a}_n \models \varphi(\bar{w}_n).$$

The latter lemma is a trivial corollary of e.g. [4, Lemma 5.1.14, p. 216].

In what follows, some types will be of special interest to us. If $\Gamma(x)$ is a set of formulas, M is a model and $a \in U$, then we can define two further sets of formulas on the basis of Γ:

$$Tr(\Gamma(x), M, a) = \{\psi(x) \in \Gamma \mid M, a \models \psi(x)\},$$

and

$$Fa(\Gamma(x), M, a) = \{\psi(x) \in \Gamma \mid M, a \not\models \psi(x)\}.$$

Saturated models are convenient since they allow to define asimulations over them in a rather straightforward way. But before we approach this feature of saturated models, we need to collect some technical facts about modalities of degree 1:

Lemma 4. *Let μ be an x-modality of degree 1 and let $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ be a guarded x-fragment of the correspondence language, such that $\mathbb{M} \supseteq \{\wedge, \vee, \top, \bot\}$. Let $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_u$ be arbitrary formulas in the correspondence language. Then:*

1. $\{\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\} = \{\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_1) \mid \psi_1 \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}$.
2. *If μ is $\forall$-guarded and has a monotone propositional core, then*

$$\models \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \mu(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i) \leftrightarrow \mu(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \ldots, \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i).$$

3. *If μ is $\forall$-guarded and has an anti-monotone propositional core, then*

$$\models \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \mu(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i) \leftrightarrow \mu(\bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \ldots, \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i).$$

4. *If μ is $\exists$-guarded and has a monotone propositional core, then*

$$\models \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \mu(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i) \leftrightarrow \mu(\bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \ldots, \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i).$$

5. *If μ is $\exists$-guarded and has an anti-monotone propositional core, then*

$$\models \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \mu(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i) \leftrightarrow \mu(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \ldots, \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i).$$

Proof. (Part 1) Right-to-left inclusion is obvious. In the other direction, let μ be an x-modality of degree 1 and let $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$. Then μ^- may define either a monotone or an anti-monotone Boolean function for $P_1, \ldots, P_n$. So we have 2 cases to consider:

Case 1. If μ^- defines a non-constant monotone Boolean function for $P_1, \ldots, P_n$, then by Lemma 1.2 we have

$$\models \mu^-(\psi, \ldots, \psi) \leftrightarrow \psi$$

for every formula ψ in the correspondence language. On the other hand, by Lemma 1.1, there is a superposition F of $\wedge$'s and $\vee$'s such that

$$\models \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \leftrightarrow F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n).$$

Adding the two equivalencies together, we get that

$$\models \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \leftrightarrow \mu^-(F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n), \ldots, F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)),$$

and therefore, that:

$$\models \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \leftrightarrow \mu(F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n), \ldots, F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)).$$

Note, further, that since $\wedge, \vee \in \mathbb{M}$, we also have $F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, and, therefore:

$$\mu(F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n), \ldots, F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)) \in \{\mu(\psi, \ldots, \psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}.$$

Since we do not distinguish between equivalent formulas, the latter equivalence proves the left-to-right inclusion.

Case 2. If μ^- defines an anti-monotone Boolean function for $P_1, \ldots, P_n$, then by Lemma 1.4 we have

$$\models \mu^-(\psi, \ldots, \psi) \leftrightarrow \neg\psi$$

for every formula ψ in the correspondence language. On the other hand, by Lemma 1.3, there is a superposition F of $\wedge$'s and $\vee$'s such that

$$\models \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \leftrightarrow \neg F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n).$$

Adding the two equivalencies together, we get that

$$\models \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \leftrightarrow \mu^-(F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n), \ldots, F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)),$$

and therefore, that:

$$\models \mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \leftrightarrow \mu(F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n), \ldots, F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)).$$

Note, further, that since $\wedge, \vee \in \mathbb{M}$, we also have $F(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$. Since we do not distinguish between equivalent formulas, then, reasoning as in the previous case, the latter equivalence proves the left-to-right inclusion.

(Part 2) We build a chain of logical equivalents connecting both parts of the biconditional in the statement of this part of the Lemma. Assume that μ is $\forall$-guarded, and that μ^-, its propositional core, defines a monotone Boolean function. Then μ has a form

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \mu^-)$$

in the assumptions of $\forall$-guard. By Lemma 1.2 we have

$$\models \mu^-(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i) \leftrightarrow \psi_i$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq u$; therefore the formula $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \mu(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i)$ is logically equivalent to

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} (\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \psi_i)).$$

Using the distributivity of universal quantifier over conjunction we get then the following chain of logical equivalents for the latter formula:

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1} \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} (\pi_1^m Sx \to \psi_i),$$

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i).$$

Again, using monotonicity of the function defined by μ^- and Lemma 1.2, we proceed in this chain of equivalences as follows:

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \mu^-(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \dots, \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i)),$$

$$\mu(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \dots, \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i),$$

and thus we are done.

(Part 3) Again we proceed by building an appropriate chain of logical equivalents. Assume that μ is $\forall$-guarded, and that μ^-, its propositional core, defines an anti-monotone Boolean function. Then μ has a form

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \mu^-)$$

in the conditions of $\forall$-guard. By Lemma 1.4 we have

$$\models \mu^-(\psi_i, \dots, \psi_i) \leftrightarrow \neg\psi_i$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq u$; therefore the formula $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \mu(\psi_i, \dots, \psi_i)$ is logically equivalent to

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} (\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \neg\psi_i)).$$

Using the distributivity of universal quantifier over conjunction we get then the following chain of logical equivalents for the latter formula:

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1} \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} (\pi_1^m Sx \to \neg\psi_i),$$

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \neg\psi_i),$$

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \neg \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i),$$

Again, using anti-monotonicity of the function defined by μ^- and Lemma 1.4 we proceed in this chain of equivalences as follows:

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \mu^-(\bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \dots, \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i)),$$

$$\mu(\bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \dots, \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i),$$

and thus we are done.

Parts 4 and 5 of the Lemma are dual to the parts 2 and 3 and can be proven by a similar method. □

We turn now to the key Lemma about asimulations over saturated models:

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ be a standard x-fragment of the correspondence language, such that $\mathbb{M} = \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_s\} \supseteq \{\wedge, \vee, \top, \bot\}$, let M_1, M_2 be ω-saturated Θ-models, and let $A \in W(M_1, M_2)$ be such that*

$$A = \bigcup Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2).$$

Further, assume that μ is a standard x-g.c. (not necessarily in $\mathbb{M}$) such that $\delta(\mu) \geq 1$, $\mu^0, \ldots, \mu^{\delta(\mu)-1}$ is the set of ancestors of μ, and for $1 \leq i \leq \delta(\mu)$ define $A_i \in W(M_1, M_2)$, such that

$$A_i = \bigcup Rel(\{\mu^{i-1}(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2).$$

Then for any $B \in W(M_1, M_2)$, such that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2),$$

and for some $C \in \{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\})$, the tuple $\langle C, A_2, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu)}, B\rangle$ is in $[\mu](\{A\})$.

Proof. We need to distinguish between 2 sets of cases corresponding to the two kinds of standard connectives, that is to say, arbitrary guarded connectives of degree 1 and regular connectives of degree 2 respectively. To reduce the length of formulas below, we introduce the following abbreviations for arbitrary variable y, natural $j \in \{1, 2\}$, and $a \in U_j$:

$$Tr_y^j(a) := Tr(\mathcal{L}_y^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_j, a),$$

and

$$Fa_y^j(a) := Fa(\mathcal{L}_y^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_j, a).$$

Further, we set that:

$$\neg Fa_y^j(a) := \{\neg\psi(x) \mid \psi(x) \in Fa_y^j(a)\}.$$

Case 1. Let μ be a flat connective. Then one of the following cases holds:

Case 1.1. Assume that μ has a constant propositional core. Then we have $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall, \bot) \cup \nu_x(\exists, \top)$ and also that $\{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\}) = W(M_1, M_2)$. We will show that for the binary relation

$$C = \bigcup W(M_1, M_2) = (U_1 \times U_2) \cup (U_2 \times U_1) \in W(M_1, M_2)$$

and for every B, satisfying the lemma hypothesis, we have $\langle C, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Thus, assume that $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall, \bot)$, so that μ has the form $\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \bot)$ in the assumptions of ($\forall$-guard). Assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $a_1 \in U_r$, $\bar{b}_{m+1} \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^t b$. Then we have $b_1 \not\models_t \mu$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$, that $a_1 \not\models_r \mu$. But the latter means that the formula $\pi_1^m Sx$ is satisfiable at (M_r, a_1) by some $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1} \in U_r$. So for any such $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^r a$ and, moreover, $\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle \in C$, therefore, condition (back) for $\langle A, B\rangle$ is satisfied,and $\langle C, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

The case $\mu \in \nu_x(\exists, \top)$ is similar.

Case 1.2. Assume that $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall, f)$, where f is non-constant monotone Boolean function. Then we have $\{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\}) = \{A\}$, and we need to show that for every B,

satisfying the lemma hypothesis, we have $\langle A, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$, that is to say, that $\langle A, B\rangle$ satisfies condition (back). From our assumption that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2)$$

we infer that:

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi, \ldots, \psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2) \tag{38}$$

Since μ is $\forall$-guarded, we can assume that μ has a form

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \xi(P_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

in the assumptions of ($\forall$-guard), where ξ defines f for $P_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m+1})$. By Lemma 1.2 we get, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})$, that:

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \xi(\psi(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \psi(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \psi(x_{m+1})).$$

Therefore, from (38) we can infer that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu'(\psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2), \tag{39}$$

where μ' is the following x-g.c.:

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to P_1(x_{m+1})).$$

We proceed now to verification of condition (back). Assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $a_1 \in U_r$, $\bar{b}_{m+1} \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that

$$\pi_1^m S^t b.$$

Then consider the set $Fa(\mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x_{m+1}}(\mathbb{M}), M_t, b_{m+1})$, that is to say, $Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$. Since $\bot \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x_{m+1}}(\mathbb{M})$, this set is non-empty, and since $\vee \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Delta \subseteq Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$, we have $\vee\Delta \in Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$. But then we have $b_1 \not\models_t \mu'(\vee\Delta)$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (39), that $a_1 \not\models_r \mu'(\vee\Delta)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \neg Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_r/a_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_r/a_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_r/a_1 by some $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1} \in U_r$. So for any such $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^r a$ and, moreover

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \neg Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \neg Fa^t_x(b_{m+1}).$$

This means that

$$\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2),$$

therefore, by definition of A we get that $a_{m+1}\ A\ b_{m+1}$, and thus condition (back) for $\langle A, B\rangle$ is satisfied. Whence we conclude that $\langle A, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 1.3. Assume that $\mu \in \nu_x(\exists, f)$, where f is non-constant monotone Boolean function. Then we have $\{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\}) = \{A\}$, and we need to show that for every B, satisfying the lemma hypothesis, we have $\langle A, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$, that is to say, that $\langle A, B\rangle$ satisfies condition (forth). Arguing as in the previous case, we infer (38).

Since μ is $\exists$-guarded, we can assume that μ has a form

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \xi(P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

in the assumptions of ($\exists$-guard), where ξ defines f for $P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1})$. By Lemma 1.2 we get, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, that:

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \xi(\psi(x_{m+1}), \dots, \psi(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \psi(x_{m+1})).$$

Therefore, from (38) we can infer that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu'(\psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2), \tag{40}$$

where μ' is the following x-g.c.:

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge P_1(x_{m+1})).$$

We proceed now to verification of condition (forth). Assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $\bar{a}_{m+1} \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^r a$. Then consider the set $Tr(\mathcal{L}_{x_{m+1}}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_r, a_{m+1})$, that is to say, $Tr_{x_{m+1}}^r(a_{m+1})$. Since $\top \in \mathcal{L}_{x_{m+1}}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, this set is non-empty, and since $\wedge \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Gamma \subseteq Tr_{x_{m+1}}^r(a_{m+1})$, we have $\wedge\Gamma \in Tr_{x_{m+1}}^r(a_{m+1})$. But then we have $a_1 \models_r \mu'(\wedge\Gamma)$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (40), that $b_1 \models_t \mu'(\wedge\Gamma)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(b_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup Tr_{x_{m+1}}^r(a_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_t/b_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_t/b_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_t/b_1 by some $b_2, \dots, b_{m+1} \in U_t$. So for any such $b_2, \dots, b_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^t b$ and, moreover

$$b_{m+1} \models_t Tr_{x_{m+1}}^r(a_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$b_{m+1} \models_t Tr_x^r(a_{m+1})$$

This means that

$$\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2),$$

therefore, by definition of A we get that $a_{m+1}\ A\ b_{m+1}$, and thus condition (forth) for $\langle A, B\rangle$ is satisfied. Whence we conclude that $\langle A, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 1.4. Assume that $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall, f)$, where f is non-constant anti-monotone Boolean function. Then we have $\{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\}) = \{A, A^{-1}\}$. We will show that for every B, satisfying the lemma hypothesis, we have $\langle A^{-1}, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$, that is to say, that $\langle A^{-1}, B\rangle$ satisfies condition (back). Arguing as in the previous case, we infer (38).

Since μ is $\forall$-guarded, we can assume that μ has a form

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \xi(P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

in the assumptions of ($\forall$-guard), where ξ defines f for $P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1})$. By Lemma 1.4 we get, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, that:

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \xi(\psi(x_{m+1}), \dots, \psi(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \neg\psi(x_{m+1})).$$

Therefore, from (38) we can infer that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu'(\psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2), \tag{41}$$

where μ' is the following x-g.c.:

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \neg P_1(x_{m+1})).$$

We proceed now to verification of condition (back). Assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $a_1 \in U_r$, $\bar{b}_{m+1} \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^t b$. Then consider the set $Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$. This set is non-empty, and since $\wedge \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Gamma \subseteq Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$, we have $\wedge\Gamma \in Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$. But then we have $b_1 \not\models_t \mu'(\wedge\Gamma)$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (41), that $a_1 \not\models_r \mu'(\wedge\Gamma)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_r/a_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_r/a_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_r/a_1 by some $a_2, \dots, a_{m+1} \in U_r$. So for any such $a_2, \dots, a_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^r a$ and, moreover

$$a_{m+1} \models_r Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$a_{m+1} \models_r Tr^t_x(b_{m+1}).$$

This means that

$$\{\langle b_{m+1}, a_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2),$$

therefore, by definition of A we get that $b_{m+1}\ A\ a_{m+1}$. Hence we get $a_{m+1}\ A^{-1}\ b_{m+1}$ and thus condition (back) for $\langle A^{-1}, B\rangle$ is satisfied. Whence we conclude that $\langle A^{-1}, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 1.5. Assume that $\mu \in \nu_x(\exists, f)$, where f is non-constant anti-monotone Boolean function. Then we have $\{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\}) = \{A, A^{-1}\}$. We will show that for every B, satisfying the lemma hypothesis, we have $\langle A^{-1}, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$, that is to say, that $\langle A^{-1}, B\rangle$ satisfies condition (forth). Arguing as in the previous case, we infer (38).

Since μ is $\exists$-guarded, we can assume that μ has a form

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \xi(P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

in the assumptions of ($\exists$-guard), where ξ defines f for $P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1})$. By Lemma 1.4 we get, for any $\psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, that:

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \xi(\psi(x_{m+1}), \dots, \psi(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \neg\psi(x_{m+1})).$$

Therefore, from (38) we can infer that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu'(\psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2), \tag{42}$$

where μ' is the following x-g.c.:

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \neg P_1(x_{m+1})).$$

We proceed now to verification of condition (forth). Assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $\bar{a}_{m+1} \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^r a$. Then consider the set $Fa_x^r(a_{m+1})$. This set is non-empty, and since $\vee \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Delta \subseteq Fa_{x_{m+1}}^r(a_{m+1})$, we have $\vee\Delta \in Fa_{x_{m+1}}^r(a_{m+1})$. But then we have $a_1 \models_r \mu'(\vee\Delta)$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (42), that $b_1 \models_t \mu'(\vee\Delta)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(b_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \neg Fa_{x_{m+1}}^r(a_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_t/b_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_t/b_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_t/b_1 by some $b_2, \dots, b_{m+1} \in U_t$. So for any such $b_2, \dots, b_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^t b$ and, moreover

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \neg Fa_{x_{m+1}}^r(a_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \neg Fa_x^r(a_{m+1}).$$

This means that

$$\{\langle b_{m+1}, a_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2),$$

therefore, by definition of A we get that $b_{m+1}\ A\ a_{m+1}$. Hence we have $a_{m+1}\ A^{-1}\ b_{m+1}$, and thus condition (forth) for $\langle A^{-1}, B\rangle$ is satisfied. Whence we conclude that $\langle A^{-1}, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 1.6. Let $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall, f)$, where f is a rest Boolean TFT-function. Then we have $\{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\}) = \{A, A \cap A^{-1}\}$. We will show that for every B, satisfying the lemma hypothesis, we have $\langle A \cap A^{-1}, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$, that is to say, that $\langle A \cap A^{-1}, B\rangle$ satisfies condition (back).

Since μ is $\forall$-guarded, we can assume that μ has the form

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \xi(P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

in the assumptions of ($\forall$-guard), where ξ defines f for $P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1})$. By Lemma 1.5 we get that for arbitrary $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ there exist $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \in \{\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2, \top, \bot\}$ such that the formula

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \xi(\tau_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, \tau_n(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to (\neg\psi_1(x_{m+1}) \vee \psi_2(x_{m+1}))).$$

Therefore, by our assumptions that $\mathbb{M} \supseteq \{\wedge, \vee, \top, \bot\}$ and that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2)$$

we infer that:

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu'(\psi_1, \psi_2) \mid \psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2), \tag{43}$$

where μ' is the following x-g.c.:

$$\forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to (\neg P_1(x_{m+1}) \vee P_2(x_{m+1}))),$$

We proceed now to verification of condition (back). Assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $a_1 \in U_r$, $\bar{b}_{m+1} \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^t b$. Then consider the sets $Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$ and $Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$. These sets are both non-empty, and since $\wedge, \vee \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Gamma \subseteq Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$ and every finite $\Delta \subseteq Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$, we have

$$\wedge\Gamma \in Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1}), \vee\Delta \in Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1}).$$

But then we have $b_1 \not\models_t \mu'(\wedge\Gamma, \vee\Delta)$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (43), that $a_1 \not\models_r \mu'(\wedge\Gamma, \vee\Delta)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1}) \cup \neg Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_r/a_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_r/a_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_r/a_1 by some $a_2, \dots, a_{m+1} \in U_r$. So for any such $a_2, \dots, a_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^r a$ and, moreover

$$a_{m+1} \models_r Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1}) \cup \neg Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$a_{m+1} \models_r Tr^t_x(b_{m+1}) \cup \neg Fa^t_x(b_{m+1}).$$

This means that

$$\{\langle b_{m+1}, a_{m+1}\rangle, \langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2),$$

therefore, by definition of A we get that $a_{m+1}\ A\ b_{m+1}$ and $b_{m+1}\ A\ a_{m+1}$. Hence we get $a_{m+1}\ A \cap A^{-1}\ b_{m+1}$ and thus condition (back) for $\langle A \cap A^{-1}, B\rangle$ is satisfied. Whence we conclude that $\langle A \cap A^{-1}, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 1.7. Let $\mu \in \nu_x(\exists, f)$, where f is a rest Boolean FTF-function. Then we have $\{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\}) = \{A, A \cap A^{-1}\}$. We will show that for every B satisfying the lemma hypothesis, we have $\langle A \cap A^{-1}, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$, that is to say, that $\langle A \cap A^{-1}, B\rangle$ satisfies condition (forth).

Since μ is $\exists$-guarded, we can assume that μ has the form

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi^m_1 Sx \wedge \xi(P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

in the assumptions of ($\exists$-guard), where ξ defines f for $P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1})$. By Lemma 1.6 we get that for arbitrary $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})$ there exist $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \in \{\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2, \top, \bot\}$ such that the formula

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi^m_1 Sx \wedge \xi(\tau_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, \tau_n(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi^m_1 Sx \wedge (\psi_1(x_{m+1}) \wedge \neg\psi_2(x_{m+1}))).$$

Therefore, by our assumptions that $\mathbb{M} \supseteq \{\wedge, \vee, \top, \bot\}$ and that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2)$$

we infer that:

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu'(\psi_1, \psi_2) \mid \psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2), \tag{44}$$

where μ' is the following x-g.c.:

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi^m_1 Sx \wedge (P_1(x_{m+1}) \wedge \neg P_2(x_{m+1}))),$$

We proceed now to verification of condition (forth). Assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $\bar{a}_{m+1} \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi^m_1 S^r a$. Then consider the sets $Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$ and $Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$. These sets are non-empty, and since $\wedge, \vee \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Gamma \subseteq Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$ and every finite $\Delta \subseteq Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$, we have

$$\wedge\Gamma \in Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1}), \vee\Delta \in Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1}).$$

But then we have $a_1 \models_r \mu'(\wedge\Gamma, \vee\Delta)$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (44), that $b_1 \models_t \mu'(\wedge\Gamma, \vee\Delta)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(b_1, x_2), \pi^m_2 Sx\} \cup Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1}) \cup \neg Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_t/b_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_t/b_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_t/b_1 by some $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1} \in U_t$. So for any such $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^t b$ and, moreover

$$b_{m+1} \models_t Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1}) \cup \neg Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$b_{m+1} \models_t Tr^r_x(a_{m+1}) \cup \neg Fa^r_x(a_{m+1}).$$

This means that

$$\{\langle b_{m+1}, a_{m+1}\rangle, \langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2),$$

therefore, by definition of A we get that $a_{m+1}\ A\ b_{m+1}$ and $b_{m+1}\ A\ a_{m+1}$. Hence we get $a_{m+1}\ A \cap A^{-1}\ b_{m+1}$ and thus condition (forth) for $\langle A \cap A^{-1}, B\rangle$ is satisfied. Whence we conclude that $\langle A \cap A^{-1}, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 1.8. Let $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall, f)$, where f is a rest Boolean non-TFT function. Then μ is a special guarded connective and we have $\{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\}) = \{A, A \cap A^{-1}\}$. We will show that for every B, satisfying the lemma hypothesis, we have $\langle A, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$, that is to say, that $\langle A, B\rangle$ satisfies condition (s-back).

Since μ is $\forall$-guarded, we can assume that μ has the form

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \xi(P_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

in the assumptions of ($\forall$-guard), where ξ defines f for $P_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m+1})$. By Lemma 1.7 we get that for arbitrary $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})$ there exist

$$\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n, \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n \in \{\psi_1, \top, \bot\}$$

such that the formula

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \xi(\tau_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \tau_n(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \psi_1(x_{m+1})),$$

whereas the formula

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \xi(\theta_1(x_{m+1}), \ldots, \theta_n(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \neg\psi_1(x_{m+1})).$$

Therefore, by our assumptions that $\mathbb{M} \supseteq \{\wedge, \vee, \top, \bot\}$ and that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2)$$

we infer that:

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu'(\psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2) \cap Rel(\{\mu''(\psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2), \quad (45)$$

where μ' and μ'' are defined as follows:

$$\mu' = \forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to P_1(x_{m+1})),$$
$$\mu'' = \forall x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \neg P_1(x_{m+1})).$$

We proceed now to verification of condition (s-back). Assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $a_1 \in U_r$, $\bar{b}_{m+1} \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^t b$. Then, first, consider the non-empty set $Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$. Since $\vee \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Delta \subseteq Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$, we have $\vee\Delta \in Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$. But then we have $b_1 \not\models_t \mu'(\vee\Delta)$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (45), that $a_1 \not\models_r \mu'(\vee\Delta)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \neg Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_r/a_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_r/a_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_r/a_1 by some $a_2, \dots, a_{m+1} \in U_r$. So for any such $a_2, \dots, a_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^r a$ and, moreover

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \neg Fa^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \neg Fa^t_x(b_{m+1}).$$

This means that $\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$, so that, by definition of A, we get that $a_{m+1}\ A\ b_{m+1}$.

Now, second, consider the non-empty set $Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$. Since $\wedge \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Gamma \subseteq Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$ we have $\wedge\Gamma \in Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$. But then we have $b_1 \not\models_t \mu''(\wedge\Gamma)$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (45), that $a_1 \not\models_r \mu''(\wedge\Gamma)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_r/a_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_r/a_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_r/a_1 by some $c_2, \dots, c_{m+1} \in U_r$. So for any such $c_2, \dots, c_{m+1}$ we will have both $S_1^r(a_1, c_2) \wedge \pi_2^m S^r c$ and, moreover

$$c_{m+1} \models_r Tr^t_{x_{m+1}}(b_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$c_{m+1} \models_r Tr^t_x(b_{m+1}).$$

This means that

$$\{\langle b_{m+1}, c_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2),$$

therefore, by definition of A we get that $b_{m+1}\ A\ c_{m+1}$ and hence $c_{m+1}\ A^{-1}\ b_{m+1}$.Thus condition (s-back) for $\langle A, B\rangle$ is satisfied and we conclude that $\langle A, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 1.9. Let $\mu \in \nu_x(\exists, f)$, where f is a rest Boolean non-FTF function. Then μ is a special guarded connective and we have $\{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\}) = \{A, A \cap A^{-1}\}$. We will show that for every B, satisfying the lemma hypothesis, we have $\langle A, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$, that is to say, that $\langle A, B\rangle$ satisfies condition (s-forth).

Since μ is $\forall$-guarded, we can assume that μ has the form

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \xi(P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1}))),$$

in the assumptions of ($\exists$-guard), where ξ defines f for $P_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, P_n(x_{m+1})$. By Lemma 1.7 we get that for arbitrary $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ there exist

$$\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_n \in \{\psi_1, \top, \bot\}$$

such that the formula

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \xi(\tau_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, \tau_n(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \psi_1(x_{m+1})),$$

whereas the formula

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \xi(\theta_1(x_{m+1}), \dots, \theta_n(x_{m+1})))$$

is logically equivalent to

$$\exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \neg\psi_1(x_{m+1})).$$

Therefore, by our assumptions that $\mathbb{M} \supseteq \{\wedge, \vee, \top, \bot\}$ and that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2)$$

we infer that:

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu'(\psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2) \cap Rel(\{\mu''(\psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2), \quad (46)$$

where μ' and μ'' are defined as follows:

$$\mu' = \exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge P_1(x_{m+1})),$$
$$\mu'' = \exists x_2 \dots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \neg P_1(x_{m+1})).$$

We proceed now to verification of condition (s-forth). Assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $\bar{a}_{m+1} \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^r a$. Then, first, consider the non-empty set $Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$. Since $\wedge \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Gamma \subseteq Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$, we have $\wedge\Gamma \in Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$. But then we have $a_1 \models_r \mu'(\wedge\Gamma)$

and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (46), that $b_1 \models_t \mu'(\wedge\Gamma)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(b_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_t/b_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_t/b_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_t/b_1 by some $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1} \in U_t$. So for any such $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^t b$ and, moreover

$$b_{m+1} \models_t Tr^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$b_{m+1} \models_t Tr^r_x(a_{m+1}).$$

This means that $\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$, therefore, by definition of A we get that $a_{m+1}\ A\ b_{m+1}$.

Now, second, consider the non-empty set $Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$. Since $\vee \in \mathbb{M}$, then for every finite $\Delta \subseteq Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$ we have $\vee\Delta \in Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$. But then we have $a_1 \models_r \mu''(\vee\Delta)$ and hence, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and (46), that $b_1 \models_t \mu''(\vee\Delta)$. But the latter means that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(b_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \neg Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1})$$

is satisfiable at M_t/b_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_t/b_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_t/b_1 by some $c_2, \ldots, c_{m+1} \in U_t$. So for any such $c_2, \ldots, c_{m+1}$ we will have both $S_1^t(b_1, c_2) \wedge \pi_2^m S^t c$ and, moreover

$$c_{m+1} \models_t \neg Fa^r_{x_{m+1}}(a_{m+1}).$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$c_{m+1} \models_t \neg Fa^r_x(a_{m+1}).$$

This means that $\{\langle c_{m+1}, a_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$, therefore, by definition of A we get that $c_{m+1}\ A\ a_{m+1}$ and hence $a_{m+1}\ A^{-1}\ c_{m+1}$. Thus condition (s-forth) for $\langle A, B\rangle$ is satisfied. Whence we conclude that $\langle A, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 2. Now, assume that $\delta(\mu) = 2$ and μ is a regular guarded connective. Then we can assume that Lemma is already proved for μ^-. We have to distinguish between the following cases:

Case 2.1. $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall\exists, f)$, where f is a non-constant Boolean monotone function.

Then we can assume that μ has a form $\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \to \mu^-)$ in the assumptions of ($\forall$-guard) and that $\mu^- \in \nu_x(\exists, f)$.

Consider A_2 as defined in lemma. We have of course

$$A_2 \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2). \tag{47}$$

Therefore, by induction hypothesis, for some $C \in \{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\})$ the couple $\langle C, A_2 \rangle$ is in $[\mu^-](\{A\})$.

Now assume that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2).$$

To show that $\langle C, A_2, B \rangle$ is in $[\mu](\{A\})$, we only need to verify condition (back).

So assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $a_1 \in U_r$, $\bar{b}_{m+1} \in U_t$, and $a_1 \; B \; b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^t b$. Then consider the set

$$\mathbb{F} = Fa(\{\mu^-(\psi, \ldots, \psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_{x_{m+1}}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_t, b_{m+1}).$$

This set is non-empty, since we have $\bot \in \mathcal{L}_{x_{m+1}}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, and, further:

$$\bot \Leftrightarrow \mu^-(\bot, \ldots, \bot) \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Now, take an arbitrary finite subset

$$\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_1), \ldots, \mu^-(\psi_u, \ldots, \psi_u)\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}. \tag{48}$$

Note that since we have $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_u \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ and $\vee \in \mathbb{M}$, we also get that $\bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$.

We have then

$$b_{m+1} \not\models_t \bigvee_{i=1}^u \mu^-(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i),$$

whence by Lemma 4.4 we get that

$$b_{m+1} \not\models_t \mu^-(\bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i, \ldots, \bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i),$$

and further, that

$$b_1 \not\models_t \mu(\bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i, \ldots, \bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i).$$

Therefore, by $a_1 \; B \; b_1$ and the fact that $\bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, we infer that

$$a_1 \not\models_r \mu(\bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i, \ldots, \bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i),$$

thus obtaining that there must be $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1} \in U_r$, such that we have $\pi_1^m S^r a$ and, moreover:

$$a_{m+1} \not\models_r \mu^-(\bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i, \ldots, \bigvee_{i=1}^u \psi_i).$$

Whence, again by Lemma 4.4, we get that

$$a_{m+1} \not\models_r \bigvee_{i=1}^u \mu^-(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i),$$

This, in turn, means that the set of formulas

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \{\neg\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_1), \ldots, \neg\mu^-(\psi_u, \ldots, \psi_u)\}$$

is satisfiable at M_r/a_1. But since the set in (48) was chosen as an arbitrary subset of $\mathbb{F}$, we have that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \{\neg\psi(x_{m+1}) \mid \psi \in \mathbb{F}\}$$

is satisfiable at M_r/a_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_r/a_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_r/a_1 by some $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1} \in U_r$. So for any such $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^r a$ and, moreover

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \{\neg\psi(x_{m+1}) \mid \psi \in \mathbb{F}\}.$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \{\neg\psi(x) \mid \psi \in \mathbb{F}\}.$$

This means that

$$\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi, \ldots, \psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2),$$

and therefore, by Lemma 4.1 we get that

$$\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2).$$

Whence by definition of A_2 we get that $a_{m+1}\ A_2\ b_{m+1}$, and thus that condition (back) for $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle$ is satisfied. So we conclude that $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 2.2. $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall\exists, f)$, where f is a non-constant Boolean anti-monotone function. This case is similar to the previous, the difference being that instead of Lemma 4.4 one has to apply 4.5.

Case 2.3. $\mu \in \nu_x(\exists\forall, f)$, where f is a non-constant Boolean monotone function.

Then we can assume that μ has a form $\exists x_2 \ldots x_{m+1}(\pi_1^m Sx \wedge \mu^-)$ in the assumptions of ($\exists$-guard) and that $\mu^- \in \nu_x(\forall, f)$.

Consider A_2 as defined in lemma. We have of course

$$A_2 \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2). \tag{49}$$

Therefore, by induction hypothesis, for some $C \in \{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\})$ the couple $\langle C, A_2\rangle$ is in $[\mu^-](\{A\})$.

Now assume that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2).$$

To show that $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle$ is in $[\mu](\{A\})$, we only need to verify condition (forth).

So assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $\bar{a}_{m+1} \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^r a$. Then consider the set

$$\mathbb{T} = Tr(\{\mu^-(\psi, \ldots, \psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_{x_{m+1}}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_r, a_{m+1}).$$

This set is non-empty, since we have $\top \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x_{m+1}}(\mathbb{M})$, and, further:

$$\top \Leftrightarrow \mu^{-}(\top, \ldots, \top) \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Now, take an arbitrary finite subset

$$\{\mu^{-}(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_1), \ldots, \mu^{-}(\psi_u, \ldots, \psi_u)\} \subseteq \mathbb{T}. \tag{50}$$

Note that since we have $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_u \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x}(\mathbb{M})$ and $\wedge \in \mathbb{M}$, we also get that $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x}(\mathbb{M})$.

We have then

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \mu^{-}(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i),$$

whence by Lemma 4.2 we get that

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \mu^{-}(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \ldots, \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i),$$

and further, that

$$a_1 \models_r \mu(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \ldots, \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i).$$

Therefore, by $a_1 \; B \; b_1$ and the fact that $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x}(\mathbb{M})$, we infer that

$$b_1 \models_t \mu(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \ldots, \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i),$$

thus obtaining that there must be $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1} \in U_t$, such that we have $\pi_1^m S^t b$ and, moreover:

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \mu^{-}(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i, \ldots, \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \psi_i).$$

Whence, again by Lemma 4.2, we get that

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \mu^{-}(\psi_i, \ldots, \psi_i),$$

This, in turn, means that the set of formulas

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \{\mu^{-}(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_1), \ldots, \mu^{-}(\psi_u, \ldots, \psi_u)\}$$

is satisfiable at M_t/b_1. But since the set in (50) was chosen as an arbitrary subset of $\mathbb{T}$, we have that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \mathbb{T}$$

is satisfiable at M_t/b_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_t/b_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_t/b_1 by some $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1} \in U_t$. So for any such $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^t b$ and, moreover

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \mathbb{T}.$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \{\psi(x) \mid \psi \in \mathbb{T}\}.$$

This means that

$$\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi, \ldots, \psi) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2),$$

and therefore, by Lemma 4.1 we get that

$$\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2).$$

Whence by the definition of A_2 we get that $a_{m+1}\ A_2\ b_{m+1}$, and thus that condition (forth) for $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle$ is satisfied. So we conclude that $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 2.4. $\mu \in \nu_x(\exists\forall, f)$, where f is a non-constant Boolean anti-monotone function. This case is similar to the previous, the difference being that instead of Lemma 4.2 one has to apply 4.3.

Case 2.5. $\mu \in \nu_x(\forall\exists, f)$, where f is a rest non-FTF-function. Then, as we have shown in Section 2, f is a TFT-function. Further, we can assume that μ has a form

$$\forall x_2 \ldots x_{m_1+1}(\pi_1^{m_1} Sx \to \exists x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \wedge \phi(P_1(x_{m_1+m_2+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m_1+m_2+1}))))$$

in the assumptions of ($\forall$-guard) and ($\exists$-guard), where ϕ defines f for $P_1(x_{m_1+m_2+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m_1+m_2+1})$, and that μ^- has the form:

$$\exists x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \wedge \phi(P_1(x_{m_1+m_2+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m_1+m_2+1})))$$

under the same assumptions.

Consider A_2 as defined in lemma. We have of course

$$A_2 \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2). \tag{51}$$

Therefore, by induction hypothesis, for some $C \in \{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\})$ the couple $\langle C, A_2\rangle$ is in $[\mu^-](\{A\})$.

Now assume that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2).$$

To show that $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle$ is in $[\mu](\{A\})$, we only need to verify condition (back).

So assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $a_1 \in U_r$, $\bar{b}_{m+1} \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^t b$. Then consider the set

$$\mathbb{F} = Fa(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_{x_{m_1+m_2+1}}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_t, b_{m+1}).$$

This set is non-empty, since we have $\top, \bot \in \mathcal{L}_{x_{m_1+m_2+1}}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, and ϕ above defines a rest Boolean function, hence a function which is false for at least one n-tuple of Boolean values. Therefore, we get:

$$\bot \Leftrightarrow \mu^-(Bool_1, \ldots, Bool_n) \in \mathbb{F},$$

for appropriate $Bool_1, \ldots, Bool_n \in \{\top, \bot\}$. Now, take an arbitrary finite subset

$$\{\mu^-(\psi_1^1, \ldots, \psi_n^1), \ldots, \mu^-(\psi_1^u, \ldots, \psi_n^u)\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}. \tag{52}$$

We have then

$$b_{m+1} \not\models_t \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \mu^-(\psi_1^i, \ldots, \psi_n^i) \tag{53}$$

.

Consider the latter disjunction. We can build for it the following chain of logical equivalents. First, using the definition of μ^- and the distributivity of $\exists$ over $\vee$ we transform it into

$$\exists x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \wedge \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \phi(\psi_1^i(x_{m_1+m_2+1}), \ldots, \psi_n^i(x_{m_1+m_2+1}))).$$

Further, using Lemma 1.8, we get that the latter formula is equivalent to

$$\exists x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \wedge \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} (K_1^i \vee, \ldots, \vee K_{i_k}^i \vee L_1^i \vee, \ldots, \vee L_{i_m}^i)),$$

where K's are conjunctions of ψ's and L's are conjunctions of negated ψ's. Then, using the laws of classical propositional logic we get the following logical equivalents for our formula:

$$\exists x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \wedge \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} (K_1^i \vee, \ldots, \vee K_{i_k}^i) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} (L_1^i \vee, \ldots, \vee L_{i_m}^i)),$$

and further, by De Morgan laws we push the negations out of L's, getting:

$$\exists x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \wedge \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} (K_1^i \vee, \ldots, \vee K_{i_k}^i) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} (\neg \tilde{L}_1^i \vee, \ldots, \vee \neg \tilde{L}_{i_m}^i)),$$

where the $\tilde{L}$'s are the respective disjunctions of ψ's. Further applications of De Morgan laws yield:

$$\exists x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \wedge \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} (K_1^i \vee, \ldots, \vee K_{i_k}^i) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} \neg(\tilde{L}_1^i \wedge, \ldots, \wedge \tilde{L}_{i_m}^i)),$$

and

$$\exists x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \wedge \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} (K_1^i \vee, \ldots, \vee K_{i_k}^i) \vee \neg \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} (\tilde{L}_1^i \wedge, \ldots, \wedge \tilde{L}_{i_m}^i)).$$

We now set

$$\Phi := \bigvee_{i=1}^{u} (K_1^i \vee, \ldots, \vee K_{i_k}^i),$$

and

$$\Psi := \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}(\tilde{L}_1^i\wedge, \ldots, \wedge\tilde{L}_{i_m}^i),$$

thus getting the next logical equivalent to our formula in the following form:

$$\exists x_{m_1+2}\ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2}Sx \wedge (\Phi \vee \neg\Psi)).$$

Note that since all the ψ's, by their choice, are in $\mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x_{m_1+m_2+1}}(\mathbb{M})$ and we have $\wedge, \vee \in \mathbb{M}$, we also get that $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x_{m_1+m_2+1}}(\mathbb{M})$. Moreover, since ϕ defines a TFT function, then, by Lemma 1.5, there exist $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n \in \{\Phi, \Psi, \Phi \vee \Psi, \top, \bot\}$, for which we have the last formula in the above series of logical equivalents equivalent to

$$\exists x_{m_1+2}\ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2}Sx \wedge \phi(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n)),$$

and further, to

$$\mu^-(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n).$$

By transitivity of logical equivalence, we get that (53) is equivalent to

$$b_{m+1} \not\models_t \mu^-(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n),$$

whence, by definition of μ and the choice of b_{m+1} we infer that

$$b_1 \not\models_t \mu(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n).$$

Therefore, by $a_1\ B\ b_1$ and the fact that $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x_{m_1+m_2+1}}(\mathbb{M})$, we get that

$$a_1 \not\models_r \mu(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n),$$

thus obtaining that there must be $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1} \in U_r$, such that we have $\pi_1^m S^r a$ and, moreover:

$$a_{m+1} \not\models_r \mu^-(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n).$$

Whence, using the above chain of logical equivalents in the reverse direction, we get that

$$a_{m+1} \not\models_r \bigvee_{i=1}^{u}\mu^-(\psi_1^i, \ldots, \psi_n^i).$$

This, in turn, means that the set of formulas

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \{\neg\mu^-(\psi_1^1, \ldots, \psi_n^1), \ldots, \neg\mu^-(\psi_1^u, \ldots, \psi_n^u)\}$$

is satisfiable at M_r/a_1. But since the set in (52) was chosen as an arbitrary subset of $\mathbb{F}$, we have that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \{\neg\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \in \mathbb{F}\}$$

is satisfiable at M_r/a_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_r/a_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied

in M_r/a_1 by some $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1} \in U_r$. So for any such $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^r a$ and, moreover

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \{\neg\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \in \mathbb{F}\}.$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \{\neg\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)(x) \mid \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \in \mathbb{F}\}.$$

This means that

$$\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2).$$

Whence by the definition of A_2 we get that $a_{m+1}\ A_2\ b_{m+1}$, and thus that condition (back) for $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle$ is satisfied. So we conclude that $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$.

Case 2.6. $\mu \in \nu_x(\exists\forall, f)$, where f is a rest non-TFT-function. Then, as we have shown in Section 2, f is an FTF-function. Further, we can assume that μ has a form

$$\exists x_2 \ldots x_{m_1+1}(\pi_1^{m_1} Sx \wedge \forall x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \to \phi(P_1(x_{m_1+m_2+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m_1+m_2+1}))))$$

in the assumptions of ($\forall$-guard) and ($\exists$-guard), where ϕ defines f for $P_1(x_{m_1+m_2+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m_1+m_2+1})$, and that μ^- has the form:

$$\forall x_{m_1+2} \ldots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \to \phi(P_1(x_{m_1+m_2+1}), \ldots, P_n(x_{m_1+m_2+1})))$$

under the same assumptions.

Consider A_2 as defined in lemma. We have of course

$$A_2 \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2). \tag{54}$$

Therefore, by induction hypothesis, for some $C \in \{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\})$ the couple $\langle C, A_2\rangle$ is in $[\mu^-](\{A\})$.

Now assume that

$$B \in Rel(\{\mu(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2).$$

To show that $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle$ is in $[\mu](\{A\})$, we only need to verify condition (forth).

So assume that $\{r, t\} = \{1, 2\}$ and that we have $\bar{a}_{m+1} \in U_r$, $b_1 \in U_t$, and $a_1\ B\ b_1$. Moreover, assume that $\pi_1^m S^r a$. Then consider the set

$$\mathbb{T} = Tr(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_{x_{m_1+m_2+1}}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_r, a_{m+1}).$$

This set is non-empty, since we have $\top, \bot \in \mathcal{L}_{x_{m_1+m_2+1}}^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, and ϕ above defines a rest Boolean function, hence a function which is true for at least one n-tuple of Boolean values. Therefore, we get:

$$\top \Leftrightarrow \mu^-(Bool_1, \ldots, Bool_n) \in \mathbb{F},$$

for appropriate $Bool_1, \ldots, Bool_n \in \{\top, \bot\}$. Now, take an arbitrary finite subset

$$\{\mu^-(\psi_1^1,\dots,\psi_n^1),\dots,\mu^-(\psi_1^u,\dots,\psi_n^u)\}\subseteq\mathbb{T}. \tag{55}$$

We have then

$$a_{m+1}\models_r\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}\mu^-(\psi_1^i,\dots,\psi_n^i) \tag{56}$$

.

Consider the latter conjunction. We can build for it the following chain of logical equivalents. First, using the definition of μ^- and the distributivity of $\forall$ over $\wedge$ we transform it into

$$\forall x_{m_1+2}\dots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2}Sx\to\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}\phi(\psi_1^i(x_{m_1+m_2+1}),\dots,\psi_n^i(x_{m_1+m_2+1}))).$$

Further, using Lemma 1.9, we get that the latter formula is equivalent to

$$\forall x_{m_1+2}\dots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2}Sx\to\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}(K_1^i\wedge,\dots,\wedge K_{i_k}^i\wedge L_1^i\wedge,\dots,\wedge L_{i_m}^i)),$$

where K's are disjunctions of ψ's and L's are disjunctions of negated ψ's. Then, using the laws of classical propositional logic we get the following logical equivalents for our formula:

$$\forall x_{m_1+2}\dots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2}Sx\to\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}(K_1^i\wedge,\dots,\wedge K_{i_k}^i)\wedge\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}(L_1^i\wedge,\dots,\wedge L_{i_m}^i)),$$

and further, by De Morgan laws we push the negations out of L's, getting:

$$\forall x_{m_1+2}\dots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2}Sx\to\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}(K_1^i\wedge,\dots,\wedge K_{i_k}^i)\wedge\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}(\neg\tilde{L}_1^i\wedge,\dots,\wedge\neg\tilde{L}_{i_m}^i)),$$

where the $\tilde{L}$'s are the respective conjunctions of ψ's. Further applications of De Morgan laws yield:

$$\forall x_{m_1+2}\dots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2}Sx\to\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}(K_1^i\wedge,\dots,\wedge K_{i_k}^i)\wedge\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}\neg(\tilde{L}_1^i\vee,\dots,\vee\tilde{L}_{i_m}^i)),$$

and

$$\forall x_{m_1+2}\dots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2}Sx\to\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}(K_1^i\wedge,\dots,\wedge K_{i_k}^i)\wedge\neg\bigvee_{i=1}^{u}(\tilde{L}_1^i\vee,\dots,\vee\tilde{L}_{i_m}^i)).$$

We now set

$$\Phi:=\bigwedge_{i=1}^{u}(K_1^i\wedge,\dots,\wedge K_{i_k}^i),$$

and

$$\Psi:=\bigvee_{i=1}^{u}(\tilde{L}_1^i\vee,\dots,\vee\tilde{L}_{i_m}^i),$$

thus getting the next logical equivalent to our formula in the following form:

$$\forall x_{m_1+2} \dots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \to (\Phi \wedge \neg\Psi)).$$

Note that since all the ψ's, by their choice, are in $\mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x_{m_1+m_2+1}}(\mathbb{M})$ and we have $\wedge, \vee \in \mathbb{M}$, we also get that $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_{x_{m_1+m_2+1}}(\mathbb{M})$. Moreover, since ϕ defines an FTF function, then, by Lemma 1.6, there exist $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \in \{\Phi, \Psi, \Phi \wedge \Psi, \top, \bot\}$, for which we have the last formula in the above series of logical equivalents equivalent to

$$\forall x_{m_1+2} \dots x_{m_1+m_2+1}(\pi_{m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2} Sx \to \phi(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)),$$

and further, to

$$\mu^-(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n).$$

Therefore, we get that (56) is equivalent to

$$a_{m+1} \models_r \mu^-(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n),$$

whence, by definition of μ and the choice of a_{m+1} we infer that

$$a_1 \models_r \mu(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n).$$

Therefore, by $a_1 \; B \; b_1$ and the fact that $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n \in \mathcal{L}^{\Theta}_x(\mathbb{M})$, we get that

$$b_1 \models_t \mu(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n),$$

thus obtaining that there must be $b_2, \dots, b_{m+1} \in U_t$, such that we have $\pi_1^m S^t b$ and, moreover:

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \mu^-(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n).$$

Whence, using the above chain of logical equivalents in the reverse direction, we get that

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \bigwedge_{i=1}^{u} \mu^-(\psi_1^i, \dots, \psi_n^i).$$

This, in turn, means that the set of formulas

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \{\mu^-(\psi_1^1, \dots, \psi_n^1), \dots, \mu^-(\psi_1^u, \dots, \psi_n^u)\}$$

is satisfiable at M_t/b_1. But since the set in (55) was chosen as an arbitrary subset of $\mathbb{T}$, we have that every finite subset of the set

$$\{S_1(a_1, x_2), \pi_2^m Sx\} \cup \mathbb{T}$$

is satisfiable at M_t/b_1. Therefore, by compactness of first-order logic, this set is consistent with $Th(M_t/b_1)$ and, by ω-saturation of both M_1 and M_2, it must be satisfied in M_t/b_1 by some $b_2, \dots, b_{m+1} \in U_t$. So for any such $b_2, \dots, b_{m+1}$ we will have both $\pi_1^m S^t b$ and, moreover

$$b_{m+1} \models_t \mathbb{T}.$$

Thus, by independence of truth at a sequence of elements from the choice of free variables in a formula, we will also have

$$a_{m+1} \models_t \{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n)(x) \mid \mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \in \mathbb{T}\}.$$

This means that

$$\{\langle a_{m+1}, b_{m+1}\rangle\} \in Rel(\{\mu^-(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2).$$

Whence by the definition of A_2 we get that $a_{m+1}\ A_2\ b_{m+1}$, and thus that condition (back) for $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle$ is satisfied. So we conclude that $\langle C, A_2, B\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\})$. □

Corollary 2. *Let $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$ be a standard x-fragment of the correspondence language, such that $\mathbb{M} = \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_s\} \supseteq \{\wedge, \vee, \top, \bot\}$, and let M_1, M_2 be saturated models. Then binary relation $A \in W(M_1, M_2)$ such that*

$$A = \bigcup Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$$

is an $(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$-asimulation, whenever A is non-empty.

Proof. By conditions of the lemma we have that A is non-empty and that $A \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x(\emptyset), M_1, M_2)$. So we only need to show that for every i such that $1 \leq i \leq s$ there exist $A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu_i)}$ such that

$$\langle A_1, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu_i)}, A\rangle \in [\mu](\{A\}).$$

Well, given that by the assumption of the lemma we clearly have

$$A \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2)$$

then, assuming $\delta(\mu_i) > 0$, it follows from Lemma 5 that if $\mu_i^0, \ldots, \mu_i^{\delta(\mu_i)-1}$ is the set of ancestors of μ and for $1 \leq j \leq \delta(\mu_i)$ binary relation $A_j \in W(M_1, M_2)$ is such that

$$A_j = \bigcup Rel(\{\mu^{j-1}(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_n) \mid \psi_1, \ldots \psi_n \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2),$$

then for some $C \in \{A\} \cup [\mu^0](\{A\})$ the tuple $\langle C, A_2, \ldots, A_{\delta(\mu)}, A\rangle$ is in $[\mu](\{A\})$.

On the other hand, if $\delta(\mu_i) = 0$, then if μ_i defines $\top$ or $\bot$, we certainly have $A \in W(M_1, M_2) = [\mu_i](A)$. If μ_i defines a non-constant Boolean monotone function, then we have $A \in \{A\} = [\mu_i](A)$. Finally, if μ_i defines either a non-constant anti-monotone function or a rest function, then, in presence of $\wedge, \vee, \top$, and $\bot$, one can show, using respectively either Lemma 1.4 or Lemma 1.7, that for every $\psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$, formula $\neg\psi$ is also in $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$. Therefore, we have:

$$A = \bigcup Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2) = \bigcup Rel(\{\neg\psi \mid \psi \in \mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})\}, M_1, M_2) = A^{-1},$$

so that we get

$$A = A^{-1} = A \cap A^{-1}.$$

But, since $[\mu_i](A)$ is either $\{A^{-1}\}$ or $\{A \cap A^{-1}\}$, in both cases we get $A \in [\mu_i](A)$. □

5 The main result

Thus far we have only dealt with asimulations "locally", i.e. as subsets of $W(M_1, M_2)$. We now give the global definition of asimulation as a class of binary relations:

Definition 4. 1. *Let $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$ be a standard fragment. Then the class $A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}))$ defined as follows:*

$$A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})) := \bigcup\{A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2) \mid M_1, M_2 \text{ are } \Theta\text{-models}\}$$

is called the class of $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$-asimulations.

2. *We say that a formula $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$-asimulations iff it is invariant w.r.t. to the class $A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}))$.*

We are now able to formulate and prove our main result:

Theorem 1. *Let $\varphi(x)$ be a formula in the correspondence language such that $\Sigma_\varphi \subseteq \Theta$ and let $\{\wedge, \vee, \bot, \top\} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$. Then $\varphi(x)$ is logically equivalent to a formula in a standard fragment $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$ iff $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$-asimulations.*

Proof. The left-to-right direction of the Theorem immediately follows from Corollary 1. We consider the other direction.

Assume that $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$-asimulations. We may assume that $\varphi(x)$ is satisfiable, for $\bot$ is clearly invariant with respect to $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$-asimulations and we have $\bot \in \mathbb{M}$. Throughout this proof, we will write $Con(\varphi(x))$ for the following set:

$$\{\psi(x) \in \mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}) \mid \varphi(x) \models \psi(x)\}$$

Our strategy will be to show that $Con(\varphi(x)) \models \varphi(x)$. Once this is done, we will apply compactness of first-order logic and conclude that $\varphi(x)$ is equivalent to a finite conjunction of formulas in $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$ and hence, since we have $\wedge \in \mathbb{M}$, to a formula in $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$.

To show this, take any Θ-model M_1 and $a \in U_1$ such that $a \models_1 Con(\varphi(x))$. Then, of course, we also have $Con(\varphi(x)) \subseteq Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M_1, a)$. Such a model exists, because $\varphi(x)$ is satisfiable, and $Con(\varphi(x))$ will be satisfied in any model satisfying $\varphi(x)$. Then we can also choose a Θ-model M_2 and $b \in U_2$ such that $b \models_2 \varphi(x)$ and

$$Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M_2, b) \subseteq Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M_1, a), \tag{57}$$

so that we get

$$\{\langle a, b\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2). \tag{58}$$

For suppose otherwise. Then for any Θ-model M such that $U \subseteq \omega$ and any $c \in U$ such that $M, c \models \varphi(x)$ we can choose a formula $\chi_{(M,c)}$ in $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$ such that $\chi_{(M,c)}$ is in $Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M, c)$ but not in $Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M_1, a)$. Then consider the set

$$S = \{\, \varphi(x) \,\} \cup \{\, \neg\chi_{(M,c)} \mid M, c \models \varphi(x) \,\}$$

Let $\{\, \varphi(x), \neg\chi_1 \ldots, \neg\chi_q \,\}$ be a finite subset of this set. If this set is unsatisfiable, then we must have $\varphi(x) \models \chi_1 \vee \ldots \vee \chi_q$, but then we will also have

$$\chi_1 \vee \ldots \vee \chi_q \in Con(\varphi(x)) \subseteq Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M_1, a),$$

and hence $\chi_1 \vee \ldots \vee \chi_q$ will be true at (M_1, a). But then at least one of $\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_q$ must also be true at (M_1, a), which contradicts the choice of these formulas. Therefore, every finite subset of S is satisfiable, and, by compactness, S itself is satisfiable as well. But then, by the Löwenheim-Skolem property, we can take a Σ_φ-model M' such that $U' \subseteq \omega$ and $g \in U'$ such that S is true at (M', g) and this will be a model for which we will have both $M', g \models \chi_{(M',g)}$ by choice of $\chi_{(M',g)}$ and $M', g \not\models \chi_{(M',g)}$ by satisfaction of S, a contradiction.

Therefore, we will assume in the following that some Θ-model M_2 and some $b \in U_2$ are such that $a \models_1 Con(\varphi(x))$, $b \models_2 \varphi(x)$, and, moreover (57) and thus (58) are satisfied. According to Lemma 3, there exist ω-saturated elementary extensions M', M'' of M_1 and M_2, respectively. We have:

$$M_1, a \models \varphi(x) \Leftrightarrow M', a \models \varphi(x) \tag{59}$$

$$M'', b \models \varphi(x) \tag{60}$$

Also, since M_1, M_2 are elementarily equivalent to M', M'', respectively, we have by (57):

$$Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M'', b) = Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M_2, b) \subseteq Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M, a) = Tr(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M', a).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\{\langle a, b\rangle\} \in Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M', M''),$$

and further

$$\langle a, b\rangle \in A = \bigcup Rel(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M', M'').$$

Therefore, A is non-empty, and by ω-saturation of M', M'' and Corollary 2, A is a $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$-asimulation. But then, by (60) and invariance of $\varphi(x)$ w.r.t. $A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}))$, we get that $M', a \models \varphi(x)$, and further, by (59) we conclude that $M_1, a \models \varphi(x)$. Therefore, $\varphi(x)$ in fact follows from $Con(\varphi(x))$. □

6 Conclusion

The generalization of the original result by J. van Benthem achieved by Theorem 1, even if not exactly sweeping, appears to be reasonably wide. Not only does it include all the guarded connectives of degree ≤ 1, but it also covers the group of regular connectives of degree 2, which seems to be rich enough for many practical purposes. For example, given that among the binary Boolean functions there are no functions which are both TFT and FTF, it follows that for every non-constant binary Boolean function f there exists at least one regular guarded connective of degree 2 with f as a core, which consequently can be handled by asimulations.

We would like to keep this paper within reasonable space limits and so only presented here the main semantic characterization result without indicating the standard ramifications that these type of results tend to have. However, we do not see any obstacles to getting these ramifications proved by an appropriate modification of the above proofs. Thus, one can rather straightforwardly prove for an arbitrary standard fragment $\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$ that a formula $\varphi(x)$ is equivalent to a formula $\psi(x) \in \mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M})$ *over a first-order definable class* $\varkappa$ *of models* iff $\varphi(x)$ is invariant w.r.t. to the class

$$\bigcup\{A\sigma(\mathcal{L}_x^\Theta(\mathbb{M}), M_1, M_2) \mid M_1, M_2 \in \varkappa\},$$

arguing along the lines of [6, Theorem 7], [7, Theorem 6], or [8, Theorem 5].

In much the same way, there seem to be no principal difficulties in obtaining a 'parametrized' version of Theorem 1 similar to [6, Theorem 2], [7, Theorem 2], or [8, Theorem 1].

Another limitation of the above presentation is the finite cardinality of $\mathbb{M}$ in the standard fragment $\mathcal{L}_x^{\Theta}(\mathbb{M})$. It appears that a generalization of the above proofs at least to reasonably small infinite cardinalities is possible and straightforward.

One could also think of generalizing Theorem 1 onto the connectives guarded by relations of arity greater than 2. This can be interesting in connection with the possible achievement of model-theoretic characterizations of e.g. sets of standard translations induced by relevance logics. This problem does not seem to be very difficult, although we cannot provide any such generalization offhand.

Also, our main result can be easily extended onto non-standard guarded fragments of special form. Generally speaking, for every given guarded connective $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$ one must also demand that $\mu^1, \ldots, \mu^{\delta(\mu)-1} \in \mathbb{M}$. For regular guarded connectives this condition can be weakened in various ways. For instance, when dealing with modalities it is sufficient that the series of μ's ancestors present in $\mathbb{M}$ starts with μ^2 and every gap in it contains at most 1 ancestor.

However, the most natural and tricky question is whether Theorem 1 in its most general form can be extended onto guarded fragments, containing at least some types of non-standard connectives, that is to say, without adding any other conditions on the form of these fragments. It is not exactly clear how many non-standard guarded connectives of degree 2 can be taken on board in this way, although we conjecture that their number should not be very big. Extension of Theorem 1 onto the degrees exceeding 2, if possible at all, appears to require methods different from the ones employed in the present paper. Indeed, when considering guarded connectives of higher degrees, one can no longer rely on distributivity properties which turned out to be pivotal for our arguments about the guarded connectives of degree 2.

7 Acknowledgements

To be inserted

References

[1] N. Alechina and D. Shkatov. A general method for proving decidability of intuitionistic modal logics. *Journal of Applied Logic*, 04:291–230, 2006.

[2] G. Badia. Bi-simulating in bi-intuitionistic logic. Available at: http://otago.academia.edu/GuillermoBadia/Papers, 2015.

[3] P. Blackburn, J. F. A. K. v. Benthem, and F. Wolter. *Handbook of Modal Logic, Volume 3 (Studies in Logic and Practical Reasoning)*. Elsevier Science Inc., New York, NY, USA, 2006.

[4] C. Chang and H. Keisler. *Model Theory*. North Holland, 1973.

[5] K. Doets. *Basic Model Theory*. CSLI Publications, 1996.

[6] G. Olkhovikov. Model-theoretic characterization of intuitionistic propositional formulas. *Review of Symbolic Logic*, 06:348–365, 2013.

[7] G. Olkhovikov. Model-theoretic characterization of intuitionistic predicate formulas. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 24:809–829, 2014.

[8] G. Olkhovikov. Expressive power of basic modal intuitionistic logic as a fragment of classical FOL. *ArXiv e-prints*, Nov. 2015, 1511.01730.